

The background of the cover is an abstract, long-exposure photograph of light trails in shades of blue and white. The trails appear to be moving towards the center, creating a sense of depth and convergence. The overall effect is ethereal and dynamic.

Liturgy and Society in Early Medieval Rome

John F. Romano

ROUTLEDGE

The Routledge logo, which consists of a stylized white 'R' shape on a dark blue background.

Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West

General Editors

Brenda Bolton, Anne J. Duggan and

Damian J. Smith

About the series

The series *Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West* reflects the central concerns necessary for any in-depth study of the medieval Church – greater cultural awareness and interdisciplinarity. Including both monographs and edited collections, this series draws on the most innovative work from established and younger scholars alike, offering a balance of interests, vertically through the period from *c.* 400 to *c.* 1500 or horizontally across Latin Christendom. Topics covered range from cultural history, the monastic life, relations between Church and State to law and ritual, palaeography and textual transmission. All authors, from a wide range of disciplinary backgrounds, share a commitment to innovation, analysis and historical accuracy.

About the volume

The liturgy, the public worship of the Catholic Church, was crucial in forging the society of early medieval Rome, in that it oriented Roman society to God and fostered the dominance of the clergy. This study places the liturgy center stage, filling a gap in research on early medieval Rome and demonstrating the utility of investigating how it functioned in medieval Europe. As well as analyzing the papal Mass and other liturgical events, Romano's book provides an English translation and commentary of the first extant Mass liturgy.

About the author

John F. Romano is Assistant Professor of History at Benedictine College in Atchison, Kansas, where he teaches ancient and medieval history and serves as Chair of the History Department. His research interests focus on medieval liturgy, and he has previously published articles in *Mediaeval Studies*, *Viator* and *Sacris Erudiri*.

This page has been left blank intentionally

LITURGY AND SOCIETY
IN EARLY MEDIEVAL ROME

Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West

General Editors

*Brenda Bolton, Anne J. Duggan
and Damian J. Smith*

Other titles in the series:

Episcopal Appointments in England, c. 1214-1344

From Episcopal Election to Papal Provision

Katherine Harvey

Joachim of Fiore and the Influence of Inspiration

Essays in Memory of Marjorie E. Reeves (1905-2003)

Edited by Julia Eva Wannenmacher

Entering a Clerical Career at the Roman Curia, 1458-1471

Kirsi Salonen and Jussi Hanska

Pope Alexander III (1159-81)

The Art of Survival

Edited by Peter D. Clarke and Anne J. Duggan

Motherhood, Religion, and Society in Medieval Europe, 400-1400

Essays Presented to Henrietta Leyser

Edited by Conrad Leyser and Lesley Smith

Hugh of Amiens and the Twelfth-Century Renaissance

Ryan P. Freeburn

Commemorating the Dead in Late Medieval Strasbourg

The Cathedral's Book of Donors and Its Use (1320-1521)

Charlotte A. Stanford

Ansgar, Rimbert and the Forged Foundations of Hamburg-Bremen

Eric Knibbs

Saving the Souls of Medieval London

Perpetual Chantry at St Paul's Cathedral, c.1200-1548

Marie-Hélène Rousseau

Readers, Texts and Compilers in the Earlier Middle Ages

Studies in Medieval Canon Law in Honour of Linda Fowler-Magerl

Edited by Martin Brett and Kathleen G. Cushing

Liturgy and Society in Early Medieval Rome

JOHN F. ROMANO
Benedictine College, USA

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2014 by Ashgate Publishing

Published 2016 by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © John F. Romano 2014

John F. Romano has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the author of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

The Library of Congress has cataloged the printed edition as follows:

LoC data has been applied for.

ISBN 978-1-4094-4393-3 (hbk)

ISBN 978-1-3155-9275-6 (ebk)

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>Abbreviations</i>	<i>xi</i>
Introduction	1
1 Mass in Early Medieval Rome	25
2 Shaping the Papal Court by Liturgy	75
3 Unifying the City through Liturgy	109
4 Defining a Society through Worship	141
5 Prayer in Roman Society	171
Conclusion	207
Appendix 1: Rereading Michel Andrieu's Edition of the First Roman Ordo	219
Appendix 2: A New Presentation and Translation of the First Roman Ordo	229
Appendix 3: Commentary on the Translation of the First Roman Ordo	249
Appendix 4: Overview of the Papal Mass of the First Roman Ordo	261
<i>Select Bibliography</i>	<i>277</i>
<i>Index</i>	<i>299</i>

This page has been left blank intentionally

Acknowledgments

While only one name appears on the title page of this book, I have incurred numerous debts while completing my research and writing. It is my pleasure to extend my gratitude to those who have contributed to my work here.

No scholarly book is better than the resources it draws upon, and in this regard I have been fortunate indeed. My initial research was completed at the libraries of Harvard University, but I consulted the collection of the New York Public Library at critical points in the investigation. A word of sincere gratitude goes out to the tireless librarians at Colorado College, Moravian College, and Benedictine College who have fulfilled my many obscure requests. Jane Schuele of Benedictine College in particular has cheerfully provided me with a library of loaned material.

Two grants have given me the time to crystallize much of my thinking about liturgy in medieval Rome. I am grateful for being awarded a Fulbright grant, which allowed me to live and work in the eternal city for a year. A postdoctoral grant from the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies was instrumental in furthering my research; I extend my thanks to Jonathan Black and Roger Reynolds, who were always ready to share their expertise.

I have presented portions of this book in several different forums: the medieval conferences at Kalamazoo and Leeds, the Mid-America Medieval Association, a meeting of the American Historical Association, and faculty colloquia at both Colorado College and Benedictine College. I should like to thank those in attendance collectively for their probing questions and comments.

Several fellow scholars have shared their expertise with me. In particular, I am indebted to John F. Baldovin, Thomas N. Bisson, Sible de Blaauw, Paolo Delogu, John Duffy, Herman Geertman, Felix Just, Lidia Paroli, Frederick Paxton, Lucia Sagui, Daniel Sheerin, Suzanne Spain, and Robert Taft, all of whom answered my questions and gave me much to think about. The late Angeliki E. Laiou has thoroughly influenced the way that I understand the Middle Ages, and I hope (in some small way) the lessons she taught me live on in these pages. Joseph Dyer is a model of scholarly generosity: he offered me several references and read through my translation of the First Roman Ordo, giving me numerous suggestions. Many will recognize the stamp of Michael McCormick's rigorous methodology in this book. In my work with him, he was always ready with another reference or astute observation. He was never content to let a poorly researched point slip his notice.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank my editor, Emily Yates, for her dedication to seeing the book to publication and her patience with me. I appreciated her sharp editorial eye, which greatly improved the text. I am grateful too to the editors of *Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West* for agreeing to include my book in their series. The anonymous readers for Ashgate took their work seriously, providing me with extensive and thoughtful comments; I thank them for their labors.

Finally, at every turn in my life, I have had the support of a warm and loving family, and they have done much to make me who I am today. My wife Julie has provided me with encouragement and affection during the process of writing, and has expertly assumed the thankless job of proofreading my drafts. I also wish to extend my gratitude in a special way to my parents, Julie and Joseph. They first sparked my intellectual interest in childhood and continually supported me throughout my life. It is a debt that can never be fully repaid. But I want to at least start by dedicating this book to them.

Abbreviations

<i>Antiphonale</i>	<i>Antiphonale missarum sextuplex</i> , ed. René-Jean Hesbert (Brussels, 1935)
C	collect (prayer)
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina
Gregory I, <i>Registrum</i>	Gregory I, <i>Registrum</i> , ed. Dag Norberg, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 140–140A (Turnhout, 1982)
Jungmann, <i>MS</i>	Josef A. Jungmann, <i>Missarum sollemnia: Eine genetische Erklärung der römischen Messe</i> (5th edn, 2 vols, Vienna, 1962)
LP ¹ (Duchesne)	<i>Liber pontificalis</i> , ed. Louis Duchesne, 3 vols (Paris, 1981), for lives after CE 715
LP (Geertman)	‘Le biografie del <i>Liber pontificalis</i> 311 al 535: Testo e commentario’, ed. Herman Geertman, in <i>idem</i> , <i>Hic Fecit Basilicam. Studi sul Liber pontificalis e gli edifici ecclesiastici di Roma da Silvestro a Silverio</i> , ed. Sible de Blaauw and Christina E. van der Laan (Leuven, Paris, and Dudley, MA, 2004), 169–235, for lives CE 311–535
LP (Mommsen)	<i>Libri Pontificalis pars prior: Gestorum pontificum Romanorum, volumen I, Libri pontificalis pars prior</i> , ed. Theodor Mommsen (Berlin, 1898), for lives CE c.30–310 and 536–715
<i>L'ordinaire</i>	<i>L'ordinaire de la messe: texte critique, traduction et études</i> , ed. and trans. Bernard Botte and Christine Mohrmann (Paris, 1953)
<i>Les Ordines Romani</i>	<i>Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen âge</i> , ed. Michel Andrieu, <i>Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense, Etudes et documents</i> , 11, 23, 24, 28, 29 (5 vols, Louvain, 1931–1961) ²

¹ LP is used for the series of papal biographies collectively known as the *Liber pontificalis*. The three separate editions cited here are identified by the name of the editor.

² Fifty early-medieval *ordines* (liturgical scripts), not all of which are Roman. *Ordines* are referenced by OR (*ordo*), a Roman numeral, and the specific chapter after a colon (e.g., OR II:1 is

ORI	The First Roman Ordo or <i>Ordo Romanus Primus</i> . <i>Les Ordines Romani</i> , ii, 65–108. Also, see Appendix 2 (pp. 229–248) for a new presentation of the text with an English translation
OSO	<i>oratio super oblata</i> (prayer over the offerings)
PC	postcommunion or final prayer
PG	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i> , ed. Jacques-Paul Migne (Paris, 1841–1855)
PL	<i>Patrologia Latina</i> , ed. Jacques-Paul Migne (Paris, 1857–1866)
<i>Le sacramentaire grégorien</i>	<i>Le sacramentaire grégorien: Ses principales formes d'après les plus anciens manuscrits</i> , ed. Jean Deshusses, <i>Spicilegium Friburgense</i> , 16, 24, 28 (Fribourg, 1971, 1979, 1982)

Introduction

Liturgy and Martin I

The career of Pope Martin I (649–655) conforms to the standard expectations for papal behavior in the early Middle Ages.¹ He became embroiled in a bitter dispute over the doctrine of Monotheletism, which hinged on whether Jesus had the same will as God the Father. His refusal to toe the imperial line, that the two divine persons shared one will, would cause a deep split with the Byzantine emperor, who ultimately would have the pope abducted to die a miserable death in exile. The rift over orthodoxy during Martin's papacy and his clashes for power with the Byzantine emperor are standard themes in the papal history of this period and have been amply studied.² Martin I's trials are a powerful example of the intertwined and tortured histories of religious belief and politics in early medieval culture, but hardly seem relevant to how anyone worshipped.

Yet several events of this conflict make little sense within the standard narrative. The patriarch Paul of Constantinople made the baffling and ostensibly wanton choice to destroy the altar of the papal ambassadors, the *apocrisarii*, making it impossible for them to celebrate the Mass.³ The decision to abduct Martin was the second plan to rid the emperor of the stubborn pope: the exarch, the imperial representative in Italy, initially made an attempt on the pontiff's life.⁴ More shocking than the emperor's resorting to violence against the pope was that the assassination was planned to occur during a Mass when Martin was distributing the Eucharist. Only a miraculous blinding of his would-be assassin was reputed to have saved Martin's life. Once Martin was taken to Constantinople, he was summarily and without explanation stripped of the

¹ For Martin I, see LP (Mommsen), 181–4, and B. Neil, *Seventh-century Popes and Martyrs: The Political Hagiography of Anastasius Bibliothecarius* (Turnhout and NSW, Australia, 2006). For research on Martin I, see esp. *Martino I papa (649–653) e il suo tempo: atti del XXVIII Convegno storico internazionale, Todi, 13–16 ottobre 1991* (Spoleto, 1992).

² E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, 2 vols (Tübingen, 1930 and 1933), ii, 553–86; P. Llewellyn, *Rome in the Dark Ages* (London, 1971), 149–56; T.S. Brown, *Gentlemen and Officers: Imperial Administration and Aristocratic Power in Byzantine Italy A.D. 554–800* (London, 1984), 161, 179–80; J. Richards, *The Popes and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages, 476–752* (London and Boston, 1979), 186–91.

³ LP (Mommsen), 181.

⁴ LP (Mommsen), 183.

woolen band known as the pallium, along with other vestments.⁵ Martin's behavior also appears puzzling. He engaged in an unexplained ritual referred to as the "Kiss of Peace," most poignantly with one of those imprisoned with him before his exile.⁶ What is more, despite his imprisonment for a doctrinal issue, Martin's biographer claimed that Martin was fighting not for his beliefs but for the worship of God (*pro cultu Dei*).⁷ What sense can be made of these episodes, and how can they be incorporated into the history of the papacy or the city of Rome in the early Middle Ages?

The examples I have cited, upon further examination, lend themselves to ready explanation only when the liturgy is taken into account. The decision to refrain from doctrinal agreement with the emperor meant that the two parties could not jointly partake of the Eucharist. All parties involved believed that it was the body and blood of Jesus, but it was more than that: it was a powerful symbol of unity.⁸ Destroying the altar of the papal ambassadors was an outward sign that ecclesiastical fraternity had already been broken. Planning the assassination attempt for the Mass made perfect sense: it was anticipated that the pope would, as part of his pastoral duties, distribute the Eucharist himself and be vulnerable to attack in the laity's section of the crowded church.⁹ The pallium, a garment only he (and those permitted by him) could wear, represented the pope's status as a shepherd, but it was a liturgical vestment:¹⁰ stripping it implied that the pope would no longer have the necessary accoutrements to perform the elaborate papal Mass. The "Kiss of Peace" would have been recognized as a part of the Mass, and symbolized the peace and harmony that was ideally supposed to exist between the pope and his clergy.¹¹ Imitating this gesture in the dark circumstances of Martin's arrest would have expressed solidarity in the face of adversity and harkened back to happier days in Rome. The characterization of Martin's struggle as centered around worship, though surprising to modern ears, emphasizes the overwhelming importance liturgy had in defining what it meant to be Christian at the time. In fact, none of these examples is extraordinary

⁵ *Narrationes de exilio sancti papae Martini*, ed. and trans. in B. Neil, *Seventh-century Popes and Martyrs*, 147–233, at 200–203.

⁶ LP (Mommsen), 181; *Narrationes de exilio sancti papae Martini*, 214–17.

⁷ *Narrationes de exilio sancti papae Martini*, 184–7. Translations, unless otherwise noted, are my own.

⁸ See my Chapter 3 below.

⁹ See my Chapter 1 below.

¹⁰ J. Braun, *Die liturgische Gewandung im Occident und Orient: nach Ursprung und Entwicklung, Verwendung und Symbolik* (Freiburg im Breisgau and St. Louis, MO, 1907), 631–4.

¹¹ ORI:49, 96. L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien. Etude sur la liturgie latine avant Charlemagne*, 5th edn (Paris, 1925 [1889]), 173; *L'Eglise en prière: Introduction à la liturgie*, ed. A.G. Martimort et al. (Paris, 1961), 421–22. See also my Chapter 3 below.

considering that Martin I came from an institution and a city that understood well the power of the liturgy.

Studying the Liturgy

The liturgy, the public worship of the Church, was one of the most formative characteristics of medieval religion, if not medieval life as a whole.¹² Despite the significance the liturgy held for contemporaries, its study has not lent itself to historical analysis.¹³ One historian of early medieval Rome dryly compared those who studied the liturgy to initiates in a mystery cult,¹⁴ and since then little has contradicted this judgment. Even as medieval religion as a whole becomes a subject of growing interest,¹⁵ the study of ritual manifestations of people's beliefs has not experienced a similar flourishing. The lack of engagement with the liturgy may stem from long-standing dismissive attitudes against "mere ritual" as opposed to supposedly more sincere demonstrations of faith.¹⁶ Medieval liturgy also has the reputation of a technically complicated field impervious to outsiders,¹⁷ and one in which the history is frequently interwoven with theology.¹⁸ As a result, few books that deal extensively with the liturgy have become widely read among medieval historians.¹⁹

¹² For a recent overview of medieval liturgy, see *The Liturgy of the Medieval Church*, ed. T.J. Heffernan and E.A. Matter, 2nd edn (Kalamazoo, 2005). Relevant for my interests is the contribution of C.C. Flanigan, K. Ashley, and P. Sheingorn, 'Liturgy as Social Performance: Expanding the Definitions' (635–52), which suggests the importance of liturgy in transmitting values and negotiating power.

¹³ C. Hannick, 'Liturgie und Geschichtsschreibung', in *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. A. Scharer and G. Scheibelreiter (Vienna, 1994), 179–85.

¹⁴ J. Richards, *Consul of God. The Life and Times of Gregory the Great* (London and Boston, 1980), 119.

¹⁵ For two recent scholarly collections, see *Medieval Religion: New Approaches*, ed. C. H. Berman (New York, 2004); and *Medieval Christianity in Practice*, ed. M. Rubin (Princeton, 2009).

¹⁶ E. Muir, *Ritual in Early Modern Europe*, 2nd edn (Cambridge and New York, 2005), esp. 6–11.

¹⁷ This is one of the reasons this helpful guide was written: A. Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office: A Guide to Their Organization and Terminology* (Toronto and Buffalo, 1982).

¹⁸ For example, F.C. Senn, *The People's Work: A Social History of the Liturgy* (Minneapolis, MN, 2006).

¹⁹ See E. Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c. 1400–c. 1580*, 2nd edn (New Haven, 2005); S. Hamilton, *The Practice of Penance, 900–1050* (Suffolk, 2001).

When scholars do choose to engage with the liturgy, they often do so in a way that does not incorporate liturgy with history. Many of the best read and cited books on the liturgy are designed primarily to introduce the reader to its sources, since this basic knowledge is presumed to be lacking among most medievalists.²⁰ Pierre-Marie Gy wrote thought-provoking contributions that exposed readers to some of the issues of the relationship between liturgy and history, but veered close to theology at times and did not always allot himself enough space to resolve the questions he set out to answer.²¹ In Richard Pfaff's monumental study of the liturgy of medieval England, books and manuscripts take center stage, but he is hesitant to make broader claims about the societal place the liturgy occupied.²² Previous attempts at conceptualizing the relationship between liturgy and society have emphasized its theological significance.²³ Eric Palazzo's survey of secondary literature on liturgy and society is intended to expose scholars to new and often interdisciplinary approaches, derived in large part from sociology and anthropology.²⁴ Palazzo's interests lay mainly in the history of mentalities, and his bibliography is largely Francophone. Yet he usefully issues a challenge to historians to investigate this area of study further. Case studies that show the interplay between liturgy and mentalities are still unfortunately relatively few.²⁵ Only a handful of focused studies begin the difficult task of seeing how the liturgy was incorporated into the functioning of societies as a whole, whether it be Carolingian Europe,²⁶ the Ottonian Empire,²⁷ or the cities Benevento²⁸ or

²⁰ E. Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books from the Beginning to the Thirteenth Century*, trans. M. Beaumont (Collegeville, MN, 1998); R.W. Pfaff, *Medieval Latin Liturgy: A Select Bibliography* (Toronto, 1982); C. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. and rev. W.G. Storey and N.K. Rasmussen (Washington, DC, 1986).

²¹ P.M. Gy, *La liturgie dans l'histoire* (Paris, 1990).

²² R.W. Pfaff, *The Liturgy in Medieval England: A History* (Cambridge, 2009).

²³ A.G. Herbert, *Liturgy and Society: The Function of the Church in the Modern World* (London, 1935); *Liturgie und Gesellschaft*, ed. H.B. Meyer (Innsbruck, Vienna, and Munich, 1970).

²⁴ E. Palazzo, *Liturgie et société au Moyen Age* (Paris, 2000).

²⁵ B. Rosenwein, "Feudal War and Monastic Peace: Cluniac Liturgy as Ritual Aggression," *Viator*, 2 (1971), 129–57; M. Collins, "Evangelization, Catechesis, and the Beginnings of Western Eucharistic Theology," *Louvain Studies*, 23 (1998), 124–42.

²⁶ P. Riché, *Daily Life in the World of Charlemagne*, trans. J.A. McNamara (Philadelphia, 1988), 230–45.

²⁷ H. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century: Mentalities and Social Orders*, trans. P. Geary (Chicago, 1991), esp. 30–49, 67–77, 210–16, 275–7.

²⁸ R.F. Gyug, "Du rite bénéventain à l'usage de Bénévent," in *La cathédrale de Bénévent*, ed. T.F. Kelly (Ghent, 1999), 67–97.

Chartres.²⁹ There have also been some pioneering studies that examine the role that the Mass in particular played in late medieval society.³⁰

If there is a lack of interest in historical circles in probing more deeply into the liturgy, the lack of interest is returned in equal measure by those who study the liturgy. Those who devote themselves to the study of the liturgy have often neglected everyday life and what relation it may have had to worship.³¹ The few surveys of medieval liturgy endeavor to provide comprehensive coverage of the form of medieval liturgy across several periods and places.³² However learned these studies are, it was not on the authors' agenda to explain how worship worked in the societies in which it developed.³³ Part of the problem is that, in many cases, great scholars of the past had to devote much of their efforts to establishing critical editions of liturgies before any further research could be completed.³⁴

While the liturgy awaits fuller incorporation in the history of Western Europe, the task is especially critical for the city of Rome. Few would question the enormous importance of the papacy and its model of belief and worship,³⁵ and yet the papal liturgy of the Mass that would prove influential for all of

²⁹ M.E. Fassler, *The Virgin of Chartres: Making History through Liturgy and the Arts* (New Haven, 2010).

³⁰ A. Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Liturgie und des religiösen Volkslebens* (Bonn, 2003 [1902]); J. Bossy, "The Mass as a Social Institution, 1200–1700," *Past & Present*, 100 (1983), 29–61.

³¹ S.J.P. van Dijk, "Historical Liturgy and Liturgical History," *Dominican Studies*, 2 (1949), 161–82.

³² *The Church at Prayer: An Introduction to the Liturgy*, ed. A.G. Martimort et al., trans. M.J. O'Connell, 3 vols (Collegeville, MN, 1987); Jungmann, *MS*; T. Klauser, *A Short History of the Western Liturgy: An Account and Some Reflections*, trans. J. Halliburton (London, 1969); R.F. Taft, *The Liturgy of the Hours in the East and West: The Origins of the Divine Office and its Meaning for Today* (Collegeville, MN, 1986).

³³ As argued by F.S. Paxton, *Christianizing Death: The Creation of a Ritual Process in Early Medieval Europe* (Ithaca, 1990), 12–15. Paxton's study of early medieval funerary liturgy masterfully contextualizes worship in the broader culture.

³⁴ Especially relevant for my purposes is *Les Ordines Romani*.

³⁵ Two excellent brief surveys of the history of the papacy are R. Collins, *Keepers of the Keys of Heaven: A History of the Papacy* (New York, 2000) and E. Duffy, *Saints & Sinners: A History of the Popes*, 3rd edn (New Haven and London, 2006). For information on specific popes, one must consult one of three standard reference works: *Enciclopedia dei papi*, 3 vols (Rome, 2000); *The Papacy: An Encyclopedia*, ed. P. Levillain, 3 vols (New York, 2002); and J.N.D. Kelly, *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, 2nd edn (New York, 2010). One work that focuses on the papal ritual of *adventus* in the twelfth century is S. Twyman, *Papal Ceremonial at Rome in the Twelfth Century* (London and Rochester, NY, 2002).

Western Europe has been strangely neglected in the scholarship.³⁶ Scholars have recognized the possibilities that liturgical sources offer in describing Roman society,³⁷ but have not executed these studies. One of the impediments may be that no one is yet sure how to insert liturgical sources into the historical narrative. For instance, when Peter Partner wrote a general history of the Papal States, he included a description of the papal liturgy at the beginning of his book but did not connect it with the main body of his work.³⁸ Scholars have only begun to discover how the liturgy, and papal liturgy in particular, worked within early medieval Rome,³⁹ but more extensive study is required to do justice to this complicated theme. For instance, other prominent studies have demonstrated how politics and liturgy often inform one another,⁴⁰ but this insight has not been fully exploited for Rome.

Argument and Organization of this Book

This book aims to demonstrate that liturgy, far from being ancillary or insignificant, was the “social glue” that held together the society of early medieval Rome. Worship was a key factor in basic social relationships in the seventh and eighth centuries in Rome, and, more broadly, in Mediterranean culture. It created a new power constellation in the papal court and provided a unifying symbol for the city. It excluded those unwilling to submit to papal ceremonial leadership. It also forged new and efficacious relationships, both human and divine. This interaction of liturgy, social relations, and power is evident in the central act of liturgy, the papal Mass, but it pervades other ceremonies in this society as well. Rather than have the liturgy be a minor player in this story, I intend for it to take center stage. It is my hope that this will fill the gap in studies

³⁶ T.F.X. Noble, “The Papacy in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries,” in *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Volume 2, c.700–c.900*, ed. R. McKitterick (Cambridge and New York, 1995), 563–86, at 565–6.

³⁷ A.G. Martimort, *Les “Ordines,” les ordinaires et les cérémoniaux* (Turnhout, 1991), 42–3.

³⁸ P. Partner, *The Lands of St. Peter: The Papal States in the Middle Ages and the Early Renaissance* (London, 1972), 1, for its brief treatment of the liturgy.

³⁹ T.F.X. Noble, “Topography, Celebration, and Power: The Making of a Papal Rome in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries,” in *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. M. De Jong and F. Theuvs (Leiden and Boston, 2001), 45–92; C.J. Goodson, *The Rome of Pope Paschal I: Papal Power, Urban Renovation, Church Rebuilding and Relic Translation, 817–824* (Cambridge, 2010), esp. 14–18, 104–6, 136–49.

⁴⁰ E. Palazzo, *Les sacramentaires de Fulda. Etude sur l'iconographie et la liturgie à l'époque ottonienne* (Münster, 1994), esp. 173–82; C.M. Nason, “The ‘Missa pro principe’: A Merovingian Votive Mass for the Mayors of the Palace?” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 45 (2003), 430–39.

about early medieval Rome, and also illuminate the utility of investigating how the liturgy functioned in medieval Europe.

Although more attention to worship is needed for all of medieval Rome, here I focus on the period from c.590 to c.752. This range will allow me to incorporate the work of Gregory I but to refrain from discussing the complicated question of Frankish involvement with the city of Rome and its liturgy. Although artificially chosen because of the reigns of popes, I do think that the main characteristics of the city of Rome throughout this period are sufficiently similar to examine them as a whole. I will occasionally stray from this period in order to incorporate an observation from earlier or later sources, but only when I think that the evidence allows such treatment. The geography is centered on the city of Rome itself, but not all of my sources stem from Rome. Scholars of this period have increasingly called attention to Rome's attachment to a much broader Mediterranean world in the seventh and eighth centuries.⁴¹ In some cases, I draw upon evidence from comparable regions throughout the Mediterranean when it allows me to speak about an aspect of the liturgy for which there is little or no evidence in Rome. Although substantial variety existed in the performance of the liturgy throughout the Mediterranean, I hope to demonstrate that comparable attitudes held towards worship and similar tales with moral lessons about the liturgy were shared across this region. Attentive readers will further note that though I have indiscriminately employed the term "liturgy" in my title, I focus mainly on the Mass. The history of the Divine Office has yet to be written for medieval Rome.⁴² Evidence of its performance occurs (sparingly) in contemporary sources,⁴³ but lacking a basic description of it makes it too conjectural to relate it to broader societal trends.

In the following two sections of the introduction, I give the reader necessary background on the state of the city of Rome in the seventh and eighth centuries and on the sources that I employ for this study. The five main chapters of the book move from a discussion of the Mass to more focused studies on certain aspects of worship in Roman society. In Chapter 1, I will describe the visual and aural appearance of the Mass, taking special care to explain the role that the laity played in it and what kind of effect it would have had on its audience. The second chapter deals with the role the liturgy had in imposing order on the clergy and the new papal court, but also regulating its relations with the laity. Chapters 3

⁴¹ For a survey that takes the interconnectedness of the Mediterranean world throughout the period seriously, see J. Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom* (Princeton, 1989).

⁴² For a broad overview of the Divine Office, see Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours*.

⁴³ E.g., *ordines* XIII A and XIV, which include books and readings for the Divine Office (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 479–88 for the former and iii, 37–41 for the latter). Gregory II appointed monks to chant the Divine Office in San Paolo fuori le Mura (LP (Duchesne), i, 397–8), whereas Gregory III does the same at San Pietro in Vaticano (LP (Duchesne), i, 417, 421).

and 4 form two sides of the same coin. In the former, I demonstrate the power that the liturgy had to forge unity in a Roman society that desperately needed it. In the latter, I show how divisions formed by worship also had the capacity to exclude people from society, from misbehaving orthodox Christians to heretics and non-Christians. In my fifth and last chapter, I show how one of the basic components of liturgy, prayer, had overwhelming power to wipe out sin and achieve salvation. The process of praying accomplished not only these goals, but paved the way for Romans to form new relationships with one another and with God. A conclusion summarizes my results but also draws broader implications about this society and its relationship with ritual. Finally, my appendices present the critical liturgical document the First Roman Ordo (to be discussed below): an explanation for my readings; a new presentation in Latin with an English translation; commentary on my translation; and an overview of the papal Mass represented in this document.

The City of Rome in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries⁴⁴

The liturgy occurred in a Rome that was different from popular conceptions of the state of the city in ancient or Renaissance times. The seventh century has

⁴⁴ For overviews of the city of Rome in this period, see esp. three works of Paolo Delogu: "Il passaggio dall'antichità al medioevo," in *Roma medievale*, ed. A. Vauchez (Rome, 2001), 3–40; "Roma dall'antichità al medioevo. La storia," in *Roma dall'antichità al medioevo. Archeologia e storia nel Museo nazionale romano*, ed. M.S. Arena, P. Delogu, L. Paroli, M. Ricci, L. Sagui, and L. Vendittelli (Milan, 2001), 13–19; "Solum imperii – Urbs ecclesiae: Roma fra la tarda antichità e l'alto medioevo," in *Sedes regiae (ann. 400–800)*, ed. G. Ripoli and J.M. Gurt (Barcelona, 2000), 83–108. Also see T.F.X. Noble, "Rome in the Seventh Century," in *Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies on his Life and Influence*, ed. M. Lapidge (Cambridge, 2005), 68–87. For histories of early medieval Rome, see Brown, *Gentlemen and Officers*; L. Gatto, *Storia di Roma nel Medioevo: politica, religione, società, cultura, economia e urbanistica della Città Eterna tra l'avvento di Costantino e il saccheggio di Carlo V* (Rome, 1999), 125–78; Llewellyn, *Rome in the Dark Ages*; T.F.X. Noble, *The Republic of St. Peter: The Birth of the Papal State, 680–825* (Philadelphia, 1984). A classic study of the history of Rome in this period is O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi* (Bologna, 1941), though this account is largely a recapitulation of the *Liber pontificalis*. For the history of the papacy in this period, the best guide is still Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*. For an overview of the physical state of the city, see R. Krauthheimer, *Rome: Profile of a City, 312–1308*, foreword by M. Trachtenberg (Princeton, 2000 [1980]); B. Lançon, *Rome in Late Antiquity: Everyday Life and Urban Change, AD 312–609* (Edinburgh, 2000). For the archaeology of early medieval Rome, see *Roma dall'antichità; Roma dall'antichità al medioevo II: contesti tardoantichi e altomedievali*, ed. L. Paroli and L. Vendittelli (Milan, 2001); R. Meneghini and R. Santangeli Valenziani, *Roma nell'Altomedioevo: Topografia e urbanistica della città dal V al X secolo* (Rome, 2004); R. Hodges, "The Riddle of St. Peter's Republic,"

been identified as a turning point in the history of the Mediterranean world and Europe,⁴⁵ though the repercussions of this changing world for Rome would largely be negative. The eternal city in the seventh and eighth centuries was physically run-down and enjoyed only limited political significance. A series of disasters in the sixth and seventh centuries had gravely affected the city. The Italian peninsula had been host to endless battles in the sixth century between the imperial army and the invading Goths.⁴⁶ These conflicts, especially several extended sieges, hit the city of Rome hard. The Lombards, a Germanic people who had swept into Northern Italy after the imperial army had wiped out the Goths in the mid-sixth century, constantly threatened to march down and conquer Rome.⁴⁷ The Justinianic Plague ravaged the Mediterranean basin, and did not leave Rome untouched: Pope Gregory I (590–604) organized liturgical processions to ward off the scourge of the plague in the city.⁴⁸ Throughout the seventh century, Muslim invaders conquered many of the richest provinces of the empire in North Africa. Trade with these provinces was severely curtailed, worsening the accumulating economic decline; Rome began to depend upon Sicily, Southern Italy, and local production for the supply of items like ceramics.⁴⁹ No longer was the city of Rome provided with grain from the province of Africa,

in *La Storia economica di Roma nell'alto Medioevo alla luce dei recenti scavi archeologici: Atti del seminario, Roma 2–3 aprile 1992*, ed. L. Paroli and P. Delogu, Biblioteca di archeologia medievale, 10 (Florence, 1993), 63–78. To get an idea of the state of research on Rome in this period, see *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, 49, 2 vols (Spoleto, 2001); and *Roma nell'alto medioevo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, 48, 2 vols (Spoleto, 2001).

⁴⁵ J.F. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century: The Transformation of a Culture* (Cambridge, 1990); D. Claude, "Review of *Mahomet, Charlemagne et les origines de l'Europe* by R. Hodges and D. Whitehouse," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 91 (1998), 139–42.

⁴⁶ For a lively description of this conflict, see J.B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, 2 vols (Chicago, 1974 [1923]), i, 388–97, 404–14; Llewellyn, *Rome in the Dark Ages*, 52–77.

⁴⁷ Llewellyn, *Rome in the Dark Ages*, 199–228; Noble, *Republic*, 1–14. For a brief overview of the history of the Lombards, see R. Collins, *Early Medieval Europe, 300–1000*, 3rd edn (New York, 2010), 198–219.

⁴⁸ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 1102–4; Gregory of Tours, *Gregorii Turonensis Opera, Volume 1: Libri historiarum X*, ed. B. Krusch and W. Levison, *Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* (Hanover, 1937), 479–81.

⁴⁹ H. Patterson, "Un aspetto dell'economia di Roma e della Campagna Romana nell'altomedioevo: l'evidenza della ceramica," in *Storia economica*, 309–31; L. Sagui, "Roma e il Mediterraneo: la circolazione delle merci," in *Roma dall'antichità*, 62–8; C. Panella and L. Sagui, "Consumo e produzione a Roma tra tardoantico e altomedioevo: Le merci, i contesti," in *Roma nell'alto medioevo*, ii, 757–820.

food that had previously helped to sustain its citizens.⁵⁰ This instability was not only economic. In Egypt and Syria, the disruption in communications caused by the loss of these lands forced the bishops to improvise when they performed the liturgical custom of naming the current pope in the Mass. For over three hundred years, because of their ignorance of the popes' names, they continually repeated the name Benedict II (684–685)!⁵¹

The combined stresses upon the city led to a significant drop in its population. From the approximately million souls that had once resided in the city in the Augustan period, perhaps between 50,000 and 90,000 remained.⁵² Most of the inhabitants clustered together in the Roman Forum or on the banks of the Tiber.⁵³ Because the area between the third-century Aurelian Walls stayed the same while the population had declined so precipitously, the city of Rome felt abandoned, with small groups of people scattered throughout its vast area.⁵⁴ This is even true for the Lateran, the papal nerve center.⁵⁵ One must have been able to distinguish Rome's many hills. Burials within the city were ubiquitous.⁵⁶ Vegetation grew freely.⁵⁷ Much of its area was given over to intramural agriculture,

⁵⁰ On the disruption of late antique shipping, see M. McCormick, "Bateaux de vie, bateaux de mort: Maladie, commerce, transports annonnaires et le passage économique du Bas-Empire au Moyen Âge," in *Morfologie sociali e culturali in Europa fra tarda antichità e alto medioevo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, 45, 2 vols (Spoleto, 1998), i, 35–118.

⁵¹ *Histoire de Yahya-ibn-Saïd d'Antioche, continuateur de Saïd-ibn-Bitriq (fascicule 1)*, ed. I. Kratchkovsky and A. Vasiliev, in *Patrologia Orientalis*, 18.5 (1924), 699–833, at 706–708. For discussion, see R.F. Taft, "The Diptychs," *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 238 (Rome, 1991), 125.

⁵² J. Durliat, *De la ville antique à la ville byzantine: Le problème des subsistances* (Rome, 1990), 159–60. Meneghini and Santangeli Valenziani, *Roma nell'Alto Medioevo*, 23, estimate the number as closer to between 50,000 and 60,000.

⁵³ Meneghini and Santangeli Valenziani, *Roma nell'Alto Medioevo*, 157–205.

⁵⁴ Krautheimer, *Rome*, 311–26; Meneghini and Santangeli Valenziani, *Roma nell'Alto Medioevo*, 213–15; R. Coates-Stephens, "Housing in Early Medieval Rome, 500–1000 AD," *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 64 (1966), 239–59. The continual presence and upkeep of churches spread throughout Rome's area suggests that even more distant areas of the city were never completely uninhabited.

⁵⁵ A.F. Caiola, "Il colle del silenzio. Immagini e impressioni del Celio nella letteratura dell'Ottocento e del Novecento," in *Caelius I: Santa Maria in Domnica, San Tommaso in Formis e il Clivus Scauri*, ed. A. Englen (Rome, 2003), 13–41.

⁵⁶ R. Meneghini and R. Santangeli Valenziani, "Sepolture intramurane e paesaggio urbano a Roma tra V e VII secolo," in *La Storia dell'alto Medioevo italiano (VI–X secolo) alla luce dell'archeologia: convegno internazionale, Siena, 2–6 dicembre 1992*, ed. R. Francovich and G. Noyé (Florence, 1994), 89–111; Meneghini and Santangeli Valenziani, *Roma nell'Alto Medioevo*, 103–25.

⁵⁷ Meneghini and Santangeli Valenziani, *Roma nell'Alto Medioevo*, 213–15.

especially grain, grapes, olives, and figs, or grazing for animals.⁵⁸ Floating mills were set up on the Tiber River.⁵⁹ The city of Rome resembled an enormous farm ensconced amid gigantic ruins.⁶⁰

Famous ancient monuments of the city still stood, but they were decaying and overgrown, and some were sinking into the ground.⁶¹ People abandoned them or exploited them for spoil.⁶² Many of the columns and pieces of marble from ancient buildings ended up in the churches of the city of Rome. Rather than construct new dwellings, Romans moved into abandoned classical ones, or incorporated older structures into new residences.⁶³ The roads within the city of Rome and leading out of it were still ancient ones.⁶⁴ The numerous churches of the city, most of which had been long established, dotted the landscape like islands.⁶⁵ There were few new church foundations in this period; those erected showed continuity with ancient models of architecture.⁶⁶ The most glorious artwork in the city could be found in the churches, including new mosaics from the seventh century in Sant'Agnese fuori le Mura, Santo Stefano Rotondo, and the oratory of San Venanzio in the Lateran, and Marian icons like the ones in Santa Maria in Trastevere and Santa Maria dei Martiri (the Pantheon).⁶⁷

⁵⁸ Meneghini and Santangeli Valenziani, *Roma nell'Alto Medioevo*, 127–32.

⁵⁹ Krautheimer, *Rome*, 240–42.

⁶⁰ R. Santangeli Valenziani, “Il paesaggio urbano altomedievale nei testi del Liber Pontificalis,” in *Atti del colloquio internazionale. Il Liber Pontificalis e la storia materiale*, ed. H. Geertman, in *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome*, 60–61 (2001–2002), 225–34.

⁶¹ B. Ward-Perkins, *From Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages: Building in Northern and Central Italy, AD 300–850* (Oxford, 1984), 38–48; C. Pavolini, “L’area del Celio fra l’antichità e il medioevo alla luce delle recenti indagini archeologiche,” in *Storia economica*, 53–70. For a comprehensive description of early medieval Rome, see L. Pani Ermini, “Forma Urbis: lo spazio urbano tra VI e IX secolo,” in *Roma nell’alto medioevo*, i, 255–323.

⁶² R. Rea, “Il Colosseo e la valle de Teodorico ai Frangipane: note di studio,” in *Storia dell’alto Medioevo italiano*, 71–88.

⁶³ See, for example A. Augenti, “Il Palatino nell’Alto Medioevo,” in *Storia dell’alto Medioevo italiano*, 659–91.

⁶⁴ A. Esch, “Le vie di comunicazione di Roma nell’alto medioevo,” in *Roma nell’alto medioevo*, i, 421–56.

⁶⁵ F. Guidobaldi, “‘Topografia ecclesiastica’ di Roma (IV–VII secolo),” in *Roma dall’antichità*, 40–51.

⁶⁶ S. de Blaauw, “Architettura e arredo ecclesiastico a Roma (V–IX secolo),” in *Roma dall’antichità*, 52–61.

⁶⁷ On mosaics, see C. Ihm, *Die Programme der christlichen Apsismalerei: Vom 4. Jahrhundert bis zur Mitte des 8. Jahrhunderts*, 2nd edn (Stuttgart, 1992). On icons, see M. Andaloro, “Le icone a Roma in età preiconoclasta,” in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente*, i, 719–53.

In spite of its underdeveloped physical state, Rome still attracted new people. Pilgrims regularly visited the city of Rome to venerate its renowned cult sites and relics, both within and outside of its walls;⁶⁸ extant guidebooks show their destinations,⁶⁹ and some examples of the graffiti they scratched into walls.⁷⁰ For visitors to the city, Rome was overflowing with the remains of martyrs and the spiritual power that was associated with them.⁷¹ This was a time when Rome still had strong cultural contacts with the Greek-speaking East.⁷² Greek elites had a significant presence in the city of Rome in this period.⁷³ After the Muslim conquests, a population of refugees, many of whom were Greek-speaking monks, fled to Rome for sanctuary.⁷⁴ Between 687 and 752, eleven of thirteen popes elected were native speakers of Greek.⁷⁵ The monks of one Greek monastery, Saint Anastasius *ad aquas Salvias*, were responsible for the composition of a Greek life of St Anastasius the Persian, whose relics had been imported there from the East.⁷⁶ Some families chose to have the creed at baptism proclaimed in Greek.⁷⁷ Translations of religious works were made in Rome from Latin to Greek and vice versa.⁷⁸

⁶⁸ Llewellyn, *Rome in the Dark Ages*, 173–98.

⁶⁹ *Itineraria et alia geographica*, CCL, 175–6 (Turnhout, 1965), 303–22.

⁷⁰ C. Carletti, “Scrivere i santi”: Epigrafia del pellegrinaggio a Roma nei secoli VII–IX,” in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente*, i, 323–62.

⁷¹ F.A. Bauer, *Das Bild der Stadt Rom im Frühmittelalter: Papststiftungen im Spiegel des Liber Pontificalis von Gregor dem Dritten bis zu Leo dem Dritten* (Wiesbaden, 2004), 24–25.

⁷² Krautheimer, *Rome*, 90–105; M. McCormick, “Byzantium and the West, 700–900,” in *New Cambridge Medieval History*, Volume 2, 349–80.

⁷³ F. Burgarella, “Presenze greche a Roma: Aspetti culturali e religiosi,” in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente*, ii, 943–92.

⁷⁴ J.M. Sansterre, *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne (milieu du VI^e s. – fin du IX^e s.)*, 2 vols (Brussels, 1993).

⁷⁵ Richards, *The Popes and the Papacy*, 270. One of the reasons Greek speakers may have been chosen was that they were capable of engaging in contemporary theological debate, which required a mastery of Greek. See T.F.X. Noble, “The Declining Knowledge of Greek in Eighth- and Ninth-Century Papal Rome,” in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 78 (1985), 56–62, at 61–2.

⁷⁶ *Saint Anastase le Perse: et l’histoire de la Palestine au début du VII^e siècle*, ed. B. Flusin, 2 vols (Paris, 1992); C.V. Franklin, *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian: Hagiographic Translations and Transformations*, Studies and Texts, 147 (Toronto, 2004).

⁷⁷ *Liber sacramentorum Romanae Aeclesiae ordinis anni circuli* (Cod. Vat. Reg. lat. 316/Paris Bibl. Nat. 7193, 41/56) (*Sacramentarium Gelasianum*), in Verbindung mit L. Eizenhöfer und P. Siffrin, ed. L.C. Mohlberg, 3rd edn, *Rerum ecclesiasticarum documenta*, Series maior, Fontes, 4 (Rome, 1981), 48–50.

⁷⁸ P. Chiesa, “Traduzioni e traduttori a Roma nell’alto medioevo,” in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente*, i, 455–92.

The city was no longer the political center of the Roman Empire. Instead, the Senate became increasingly weak in the sixth century and had ceased to exist by the seventh,⁷⁹ and the emperor resided in Constantinople (modern Istanbul). The Roman emperor was still recognized as the overlord of the city of Rome, and the papacy was tied into the world of the empire.⁸⁰ Yet most authority in the Italian peninsula had devolved to the local level, and the emperor seemed ineffectual in light of Rome's difficulties.⁸¹ A military elite ruled most of Italy.⁸² The imperial military and civil governor in Italy, the exarch, controlled the duchy of Rome from Ravenna.⁸³ But the ruler of the city was increasingly the pope. The bishop of Rome had taken over tasks related to caring for the city previously administered by the emperor, like distributing food to the population and sponsoring public works such as repairs on the city walls.⁸⁴ He set up *diaconiae* to feed the urban poor and *xenodochia* to care for travelers.⁸⁵ The pope's reputation as a religious leader in the wider West had increased. In the ancient world, his was one of many significant sees, several of which identified their ultimate foundation with the Apostles.⁸⁶ But as the famous sees of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch struggled or lay empty under Muslim domination, the pope's relative standing among Christian bishops rose. The Anglo-Saxon world saw Pope Gregory I and his successors as the ones who had sponsored their conversion, and revered the pope because of it.⁸⁷ From this position of authority, the pope sent letters to instruct his followers throughout the Christian world

⁷⁹ F. Burgarella, "Il Senato," in *Roma nell'alto medioevo*, i, 121–78, at 171–2.

⁸⁰ P. Delogu, "The Papacy, Rome and the Wider World in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries," in *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West: Essays in Honour of Donald A. Bullough*, ed. J.M.H. Smith (Leiden and Boston, 2000), 197–220.

⁸¹ See, for instance, LP (Mommsen), 152.

⁸² Brown, *Gentlemen and Officers*, esp. 46–60, 101–108, 205–208.

⁸³ On the exarchate, see V. von Falkenhausen, "I Bizantini in Italia," in *I Bizantini in Italia*, ed. G. Cavallo et al. (Milan, 1982), 1–45; Noble, *Republic*, 4–5; G. Ravegnani, *I Bizantini in Italia* (Bologna, 2004), 81–143.

⁸⁴ See P. Delogu, "Roma dall'antichità al medioevo. La storia."

⁸⁵ For *diaconiae*, see O. Bertolini, "Per la storia delle diaconie romane nell'alto medioevo sino alla fine del secolo VIII," in *Scritti scelti di storia medioevale*, ed. O. Banti (Livorno, 1968), 309–460; U. Falesiedi, *Le diaconie: I servizi assistenziali nella Chiesa antica* (Rome, 1995); A. Milella, "Le diaconie romane tra il VI e l'VIII secolo," in *Cultura e promozione umana. La cura del corpo e dello spirito dai primi secoli cristiani al Medioevo: Contributi e attualizzazioni ulteriori* (Troina, 2000), 83–99; R. Hermes, "Die stadtrömischen Diakonien," *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte*, 91 (1996), 1–120. For *xenodochia*, E. Hubert, "Les résidences des étrangers à Rome," in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente*, i, 173–207; F.R. Stasalla, "A proposito delle strutture assistenziali ecclesastiche: gli xenodochi," *Archivio della Società romana di storia patria*, 121 (1998), 5–45.

⁸⁶ E. Morini, "Roma nella pentarchia," in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente*, ii, 833–942.

⁸⁷ W. Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford, 1946), 15–44.

about politics, administration, and belief.⁸⁸ The papacy structured its ministers as a court and learned how to administer a state.⁸⁹ As doctrinal controversies raged in the Eastern provinces over the nature of Christ or matters of ecclesiastical discipline, Rome became a conservative standard-bearer of the orthodox faith.⁹⁰

Gregory I frequently lamented that Rome was a city in decline, and expected that the end of the world was not far off.⁹¹ Contemporaries tended to agree, crafting Apocalyptic visions that predicted the coming conclusion to their times of tribulation in this world.⁹² They certainly had no idea that the models of leadership and worship that the papacy was developing in this period would prove influential for centuries.

Primary Sources for the Study of Seventh- and Eighth-Century Rome

The study of seventh- and eighth-century Rome and the broader world with which it interacted is often seen as a challenging one because of the lack of sources preserved to describe it. This is emphasized for sources from the seventh century, a period that suffers from a dearth of written primary material.⁹³ However, this era in European history is no longer condemned as a “Dark Age” utterly lacking in evidence.⁹⁴ Historians instead have learned to improve the methods for reading the extant sources and to increase the range of sources employed for the task.⁹⁵ One might even argue that there is a positive side of having fewer documents. Their relative paucity – especially from the early Middle Ages – allows historians to analyze each one thoroughly.⁹⁶ Liturgical sources present special problems

⁸⁸ P. Conte, *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei papi del secolo VII* (Milan, 1971); and *idem*, *Regesto delle lettere dei papi del secolo VIII: saggi* (Milan, 1984).

⁸⁹ For a discussion of the papal court, see my Chapter 2.

⁹⁰ Herrin, *Formation*, 250–59; Richards, *Popes and the Papacy*, 181–215.

⁹¹ R.E. McNally, “Gregory the Great (590–604) and His Declining World,” *Archivum historiae pontificiae*, 16 (1978), 7–26.

⁹² Pseudo-Methodius, *Die syrische Apokalypse des Pseudo-Methodius*, ed. and trans. G.J. Reinink, *Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium*, 540, *Scriptores Syri*, 220 (Louvain, 1993).

⁹³ See, for instance, *Le Septième siècle, changements et continuités: Actes du Colloque bilatéral franco-britannique tenu au Warburg Institute les 8–9 juillet 1988* = *The Seventh Century, Change and Continuity: Proceedings of a joint French and British Colloquium held at the Warburg Institute 8–9 July 1988*, ed. J. Fontaine and J.N. Hillgarth (London, 1992).

⁹⁴ An older view apparent in, for example, *Carattere del secolo VII in Occidente*, *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull’alto Medioevo*, 5, 2 vols (Spoleto, 1958).

⁹⁵ G. Halsall, “The Sources and their Interpretation,” in *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Volume 1, c.500–c.700*, ed. P. Fouracre (Cambridge, 2005), 56–90.

⁹⁶ H.W. Goetz, *Proseminar Geschichte: Mittelalter*, 2nd edn (Stuttgart, 2000), 303.

to historians of this period. Documents of worship are sometimes treated in hermetically sealed boxes with scholars failing to ask how to situate them in the historical context in which they were produced.⁹⁷ More source criticism is needed on liturgical sources to understand how to read them.⁹⁸

One of the most critical liturgical sources for early medieval Rome is an *ordo* (pl. *ordines*).⁹⁹ *Ordines* as they appear after the time of Gregory I are liturgical scripts, rubrics for the celebrant and ministers that designate how to carry out the steps of worship; they are 50 in number in Andrieu's edition. These texts run the gamut from significant to obscure rites, encompassing, for instance, the worship of Holy Week, the Mass, Divine Office, and ordination. Their individual lengths vary greatly – from a few lines to dozens of pages. *Ordines* should be distinguished from contemporary sacramentaries, which only include the prayers without any designation of actions to be performed, and later pontificals, which combined the stage directions of the *ordines* with the prayers from the sacramentaries (and can be considered the ancestors of modern missals).¹⁰⁰ Chronologically, the surviving texts of this genre extend from the late-seventh to the eleventh centuries, with the majority falling in the eighth and ninth centuries.

These anonymous compositions are a unique historical source in that they are documents of practice. Aside from the archaizing tendencies of a few manuscripts and an occasional didactic *ordo* (which included commentary on the liturgical actions), for the most part it would have made little sense to commit resources to recopying documents not used in real liturgy or not corresponding to real trends of worship. Many *ordines* are not pure Roman products, but reflect a mixture of Roman practice and the worship of Francia, where they were copied and preserved. For the purposes of my study, however, I have attempted to confine my use of *ordines* to those in the correct chronological period and those with a substantial part dedicated to the Roman rite.¹⁰¹ Using *ordines* as historical sources is no easy task. Sible de Blauuw contended that *ordines* must be used

⁹⁷ Y. Hen, *The Royal Patronage of Liturgy in Frankish Gaul to the Death of Charles the Bald* (877) (Woodbridge, 2001), 8–10.

⁹⁸ P. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*, 2nd edn (New York, 2002).

⁹⁹ The discussion on the *ordines* is drawn from Martimort, “*Ordines*,” esp. 20–50; Palazzo, *History of Liturgical Books*, 175–85; R.E. Reynolds, “*Ordines Romani* (Ordinalis),” in *The Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, ed. J.R. Strayer et al., 13 vols (New York, 1982–1989), ix, 269; H. Schneider, “*Ordo, Ordines II*,” in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, ed. R. Auty et al., 10 vols (Munich and Zurich, 1977–1999), vi, 1437–9; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 135–224.

¹⁰⁰ Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 135–6.

¹⁰¹ I consider *ordines* I (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 65–108), II (*Ibid.*, ii, 113–16), III (*Ibid.*, ii, 129–33), XI (*Ibid.*, ii, 415–17), XIV (*Ibid.*, iii, 37–41), XX (*Ibid.*, iii, 234–6), XXIII (*Ibid.*, iii, 267–73), XXVII:67–94 (*Ibid.*, iii, 362–72), XXXIV (*Ibid.*, iii, 601–13),

with caution because of their occasional idealizing or historicizing tendencies, and should be coordinated with architectural realities in order to understand how they were enacted.¹⁰² Janet Nelson, in an examination of Anglo-Saxon *ordines*, points out that special care must be devoted to understanding what participants and designers of liturgies believed they were doing, and the results should always be correlated with all other available sources.¹⁰³

The *ordo* that will prove most helpful to the study here is known as the First Roman Ordo (OR I).¹⁰⁴ This late-seventh-century document is the earliest extant Mass liturgy, and it preserves the papal ceremony for Easter Week. It was originally composed to regulate the liturgical responsibilities and hierarchy of the Roman clergy, as well as to protect the precious furnishings used in the Mass. Now it offers historians a unique witness to the ritual and society of late-seventh- and eighth-century Rome. There has been controversy about the original form of this document, and I have addressed this issue elsewhere.¹⁰⁵ As an aid to the reader, because of the frequent use of this document, I have provided a new presentation of OR I and an English translation in my Appendix 2.

Worship in this period could not have been completed solely with the stage directions of the *ordines*. Other liturgical documents provided the prayers, chants, and readings completed at these services, and in particular at the Mass. Sacramentaries list prayers pronounced in the liturgies of this period.¹⁰⁶ Certain prayers were delivered at every celebration of the Mass.¹⁰⁷ Others would change according to the occasion being celebrated. Prayers in sacramentaries were subdivided into the *Temporale* (feasts of the Lord) and the *Sanctorale* (feasts of the saints). The dates of the former were variable and often depended upon the date of Easter, whereas the dates of the latter were generally fixed. The preservation rate of these manuscripts is particularly low because they were worn out from frequent use. Especially important here is the Gregorian Sacramentary,

XLA (Ibid., iv, 295–7), XLII (Ibid., iv, 395–402), XLIV (Ibid., iv, 429–33), XLIX (Ibid., iv, 527–30).

¹⁰² S. de Blaauw, *Cultus et decor: Liturgia e architettura nella Roma tardoantica e medievale*, Studi e Testi, 355–6, 2 vols (Vatican City, 1994), i, 103–104.

¹⁰³ J.L. Nelson, "Ritual and Reality in the Early Medieval *Ordines*," in *The Materials, Sources, and Methods of Ecclesiastical History*, ed. D. Baker (Oxford, 1975), 41–51. Reprinted in J.L. Nelson, *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe* (London and Ronceverte, 1986), 329–40.

¹⁰⁴ For the biography of this document, see J.F. Romano, "The Fates of Liturgies: Towards a History of the First Roman Ordo," *Antiphon*, 11 (2007), 43–77.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ For sacramentaries, see esp. J. Deshusses, "Les sacramentaires: Etat actuel de la recherche," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 24 (1982), 19–46.

¹⁰⁷ For an edition of the unchangeable prayers of the Roman Mass, see *L'ordinaire*, 55–93.

the papal prayer book.¹⁰⁸ The Roman Mass antiphoner, which preserves the text of chants for the Mass, was composed in the seventh or eighth centuries in Rome, though it was only preserved in manuscripts north of the Alps.¹⁰⁹ Chants of the Mass would in time be separated into ordinary or unchangeable and proper or changeable, varying according to the day celebrated. There are also lectionaries for the cycle of readings for papal Masses.¹¹⁰ Although they were not used at papal Masses, I will consider the Greek euchologion or prayer book that was probably produced in southern Italy in the eighth century.¹¹¹ After all, a significant part of the population were Greek speakers and prayed in Greek. As a body, these liturgical sources provide an indication of practice and the mentalities of the people who composed and used them.

To supplement and contextualize the liturgical documents, it is necessary to look at other written sources. Historians are far better furnished with primary sources for the city of Rome in the seventh and eighth centuries than for nearly any other European city of the same period. Here I will stress in particular those that have been useful for my study. The examination of official documents issuing from the papacy itself bears fruit for probing the public positions and attitudes of the pope and his entourage. The *Liber pontificalis* constitutes a series of papal biographies produced by the papal chancery from around the mid-sixth to mid-fifteenth centuries; from the seventh century at the latest, contemporaneous histories of each ruling pontiff were prepared.¹¹² The *Liber diurnus* is probably a formulary used in the composition of letters issuing from the papal chancery, from the late seventh to mid-eighth centuries.¹¹³ Papal letters

¹⁰⁸ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 85–348.

¹⁰⁹ *Antiphonale*.

¹¹⁰ “Liturgie et basiliques de Rome au milieu du VII^e siècle d’après les listes d’Evangiles de Wurzburg,” ed. G. Morin, *Revue bénédictine*, 28 (1911), 296–330; “Le plus ancien ‘Comes’ ou lectionnaire de l’Eglise romaine,” ed. G. Morin, *Revue bénédictine*, 27 (1910), 41–74; *Das römische Capitulare evangeliorum*, Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen und Forschungen, 28, ed. T. Klauser (Münster and Westfalen, 1935). Cf. *Les lectionnaires romains de la messe au VII^e et au VIII^e siècle: Sources et dérivés*, ed. A. Chavasse, Spicilegii Friburgensis Subsidia, 22 (Fribourg, 1993). The other editions are still necessary, because Chavasse fails to include the names of the stationary churches.

¹¹¹ *L’Eucologio Barberini Gr. 336*, ed. S. Parenti and E. Velkovska, 2nd edn (Rome, 2000); M. Arranz, “Les Sacrements de l’ancien Euchologe constantinopolitain (1),” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 48 (1982), 284–335, at 295–8.

¹¹² For the dating of this document, see LP (Duchesne), i, xxiv–xlviii; C. Vogel, “Le ‘Liber Pontificalis’ dans l’édition de Louis Duchesne: Etat de la question,” in *Monseigneur Duchesne et son temps: actes du colloque organisé par l’Ecole française de Rome, Palais Farnèse, 23–25 mai 1973* (Rome, 1975), 99–127, at 111–14. This dating is to be preferred over Mommsen’s in LP (Mommsen), vii–xviii.

¹¹³ *Liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum*, ed. H. Foerster (Bern, 1958). The *Liber diurnus* has produced an enormous bibliography that fails to resolve all of its mysteries.

are scarce from the seventh and eighth centuries but, when available, provide direct testimony to the concerns of the pope who had them written. While there remains no comprehensive edition of papal letters for this period, Pietro Conte has helpfully provided a register and analysis of them,¹¹⁴ and some already appear in good critical editions.¹¹⁵ One collection of letters, many of them papal, merits special attention: some of the correspondence preserved in the collection of the eighth-century English missionary to Germany, Boniface, stems from popes and gives us an idea of papal practice of and attitudes towards worship.¹¹⁶

Although the *Liber pontificalis* provides the only continuous history of the city of Rome in the seventh and eighth centuries, several other works provide important references to events in Rome or shared attitudes on the liturgy. This includes the body of documents preserved in the late-ninth-century corpus of Anastasius Bibliothecarius, which cover in detail the seventh-century careers of Martin I and Maximus the Confessor.¹¹⁷ Another is the far-ranging history the Chronicle of Theophanes, which covers the entire Byzantine world from the late-third to the early-ninth centuries.¹¹⁸ The main focus of the eighth-century historian Paul the Deacon was the Lombards, but the author was a monk and his historical interests extended to the liturgy.¹¹⁹

H. Foerster, "Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum," in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 18 vols (New York, 1967–89), viii, 534–5; J.P. Kirsch, "Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum," in *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, ed. C.G. Herbermann et al., 15 vols (New York, 1907–12), ix, 215–16; *Liber Diurnus: Studien und Forschungen von Leo Santifaller*, ed. H. Zimmermann (Stuttgart, 1976); J.M. Sansterre, "La date des formules 60–63 du 'Liber diurnus,'" in *Byzantion*, 48 (1978), 226–43.

¹¹⁴ Conte, *Chiesa e primato*; and *idem*, *Regesto delle lettere dei papi*.

¹¹⁵ See "Die Akten der römischen Synode von 679," ed. W. Levison, in *Aus rheinischer und fränkischer Frühzeit: Ausgewählte Aufsätze* (Düsseldorf, 1948), 267–94; Aldhelm, *Aldhelmi opera*, ed. R. Ewald, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores antiquissimi, 15 (Berlin, 1913), 512–14; *La colección canónica Hispana, Volume iii: Concilios griegos y africanos*, ed. G. Martínez Díez and F. Rodríguez. Monumenta Hispaniae sacra, Serie canónica, 3 (Madrid, 1982), 181–205; "Kreta, Rom und Laon: Vier Briefe des Papstes Vitalian vom Jahre 668," ed. R. Schieffer, in *Papsttum, Kirche und Recht im Mittelalter: Festschrift für Horst Fuhrmann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. H. Mordek (Tübingen, 1991), 15–30; A. Thanner, *Papst Honorius I. (625–38), Studien zur Theologie und Geschichte*, 4 (St. Ottilien, 1989), 193–234.

¹¹⁶ *Die Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, ed. M. Tangl, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae selectae, 1 (Berlin, 1916). For Boniface, see J.H. Clay, *In the Shadow of Death: Saint Boniface and the Conversion of Hesse, 721–54* (Turnhout, 2010).

¹¹⁷ B. Neil, *Seventh-century Popes and Martyrs*.

¹¹⁸ Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1883); *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, AD 284–813*, trans. and commentary C. Mango and R. Scott (Oxford and New York, 1997).

¹¹⁹ Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, ed. L. Bethmann and G. Waitz, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Langobardicarum (Hanover, 1878). For analysis of

Hagiography increases knowledge of the world and beliefs of the people of this period. Although saintly biographies rarely provide a reliable account of their subjects' lives, they give us an idea of people's mentalities. Few examples of this genre are definitively dated to this period, but they include the Roman life of St Anastasius the Persian¹²⁰ and the life of Bishop Wilfrid of York.¹²¹ The life of Gregory I by an anonymous monk of Whitby, written c.680–704, provides a contemporary view by a non-Roman of the way a late-seventh-century Roman Mass was conducted.¹²² John Moschos' (c.540/50–619/34) series of anecdotes or exempla collected in his work *Spiritual Meadow* reveal contemporary beliefs about the Mass.¹²³ Moschos spent time in the early-seventh century in Rome, possibly dying there. Theodore of Sykeon was a late-sixth- and early-seventh-century saint from Asia Minor, whose life was written down in the mid-seventh century.¹²⁴ The *vita* of John 'the Almsgiver', the patriarch of Alexandria from 610–619, written by another native of Cyprus, Leontios of Neapolis, in the seventh century, gives an idea of everyday existence in Egypt.¹²⁵ The anonymous collection of miracle stories of the fourth-century saint Artemios was written in the mid-seventh century, likely in Constantinople.¹²⁶ It preserves precious glimpses of Byzantine life and religious practice.

Conciliar decisions provide valuable insights into clerical culture and into the official positions of the Church. Particularly important are the Roman

Paul's history, see W.A. Goffart, *The Narrators of Barbarian History (A.D. 550–800): Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Bede, and Paul the Deacon* (Princeton, NJ, 1988), 378–424; and W. Pohl, "Paulus Diaconus und die Historia Langobardorum: Text und Tradition," in *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, 375–405.

¹²⁰ For the Greek version of this life, see *Saint Anastase le Perse*; for the Latin version, see C.V. Franklin, *Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian*.

¹²¹ *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid by Eddius Stephanus*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave (Cambridge, 1985 [1927]).

¹²² *The Earliest Life of Gregory the Great by an Anonymous Monk of Whitby*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave (Cambridge, 1985).

¹²³ A new edition of this work is sorely needed. The version in the *Patrologia Graeca* must still be used. See John Moschos, *Leimôn*, PG, lxxxvii, 2851–3116. Throughout the book, I will refer to this work by its standard English translation, *Spiritual Meadow*.

¹²⁴ *Vie de Théodore de Sykéon*, ed. A.J. Festugière, 2 vols (Brussels, 1970).

¹²⁵ Leontios of Neapolis, *Vie de Syméon le Fou*; *Vie de Jean de Chypre*, ed. A.J. Festugière, Bibliothèque archéologique et historique, 95 (Paris, 1974); C. Mango, "A Byzantine Hagiographer at Work: Leontios of Neapolis," in *Byzanz und der Westen*, ed. I. Hutter (Vienna, 1984), 25–41.

¹²⁶ *Miracles of St. Artemios: A Collection of Miracle Stories by an Anonymous Author of Seventh Century Byzantium*, ed. and trans. V.S. Crisafulli and J.W. Nesbitt, The Medieval Mediterranean, 13 (Leiden and New York, 1997).

councils in 601, 721, 732, 743, and 745;¹²⁷ the Third Council of Constantinople held in 680–681;¹²⁸ and the Council in Trullo or the *Quinisextum* held in Constantinople in 691–692.¹²⁹ The Lateran Council of 649 was written by the theologian Maximus the Confessor, but it remains unclear if this means that it is an artificial rendering of the events of the council or if it is a literary fiction detailing a council that did not occur.¹³⁰ Either way, it is powerful evidence of the mentalities of the clergy of the old and new Rome.

One of the few figures who has been intensively studied from this period for Rome, albeit not normally for his views on the liturgy, is Pope Gregory I (590–604).¹³¹ Scholars have abandoned earlier theories that identified Gregory as responsible for much of early medieval papal liturgy, including the style of chant and sacramentary that were once attributed to him.¹³² The works that Gregory I truly penned are invaluable to an inquiry on the liturgy. His register preserves information about the administration, bureaucracy, and mentalities

¹²⁷ For the Council of 601, *PL*, lxxvii, 1340D–1343D. For the Council of 721, see *PL*, lxxvii, 341–46. For the council in 732, see H. Mordek, “Rom, Byzanz und die Franken im 8. Jahrhundert: zur Überlieferung und kirchenpolitischen Bedeutung der Synodus Romana Papst Gregors III. vom 732 (mit Edition),” in *Person und Gemeinschaft im Mittelalter: Karl Schmid zum fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag* (Sigmaringen, 1988), 123–56. For the Council of 743, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Legum Sectio III, *Concilia aevi Karolini*, ed. A. Werminghoff (Hanover, 1906–1908), i, 8–32; and for the council of 745, *ibid.*, i, 37–44.

¹²⁸ *Constantinople III*, in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. N.P. Tanner, 2 vols (Washington, DC, 1990), i, 124–30.

¹²⁹ For an edition and analysis of the Council in Trullo, see *The Council in Trullo Revisited*, ed. G. Nedungatt and M. Featherstone (Rome, 1995).

¹³⁰ *Concilium Lateranense anno 649 celebratum*, ed. R. Riedinger, in *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, Series secunda, 1 (Berlin, 1984). For Riedinger’s studies of this council, see *Kleine Schriften zu den Konzilsakten des 7. Jahrhunderts*, *Instrumenta patristica*, 34 (Turnhout, 1998). For analysis of the sources for the council, see also P. Conte, *Il sinodo lateranense dell’ottobre 649. La nuova edizione degli atti a cura di Rudolf Riedinger. Rassegna critica di fonti dei secoli VII–XII* (Vatican City, 1989). For a discussion of the nature of the council, see C. Cubitt, “The Lateran Council of 649 as an Ecumenical Council,” in *Chalcedon in Context: Church Councils 400–700* (Liverpool, 2009), 133–47.

¹³¹ The bibliography on Gregory I is immense. Important studies include *Grégoire le grand: Chantilly, Centre culturel Les Fontaines, 15-19 septembre 1982: actes*, ed. J. Fontaine, R. Gillet, and S. Pellistrandi (Paris, 1986); R.A. Markus, *Gregory the Great and his World* (Cambridge and New York, 1997); P. Meyvaert, *Benedict, Gregory, Bede and Others* (London, 1977); Richards, *Consul of God*; C. Straw, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*, *Transformation of the Classical Heritage*, 14 (Berkeley, 1988).

¹³² See, for instance, J. Deshusses, “Grégoire et le Sacramentaire grégorien,” in *Grégoire le grand*, 637–44; D. Hiley, *Western Plainchant: A Handbook* (Oxford and New York, 1993), 509–13.

of the Roman Church in a formative period,¹³³ and his theological and pastoral works give us an idea of how the liturgy would have been understood by his Roman contemporaries.¹³⁴ While there is always a danger in relying on one prolific informant like Gregory, his attitudes on worship, while idealized, would have been broadly shared in his time.

During this period there were several non-Roman theologians whose works reveal popularly held views about the place of the liturgy throughout the Mediterranean. Maximus the Confessor's *Mystagogia* is a powerful example of a seventh-century thinker's struggle to interpret and disseminate the mystical meaning of the liturgy.¹³⁵ It is especially relevant because of the time Maximus spent in the city of Rome in the mid-seventh century. Isidore of Seville (d. 636), whose brother Leander had been a friend of Gregory I, was known for his encyclopedic treatments of various topics, including a work on the origin of ecclesiastical rites.¹³⁶ Anastasius of Sinai was a late-seventh- and early-eighth-century monk at St Catherine's at Mt Sinai; he composed pastoral theology that tended to be moderate in tone, often designed to inform the laity of how they should act during the liturgy.¹³⁷ A sermon delivered by Anastasius II of Antioch,

¹³³ Gregory I, *Registrum*.

¹³⁴ *Sancti Gregorii Magni Expositiones in Canticum canticorum, in librum primum Regum*, ed. P. Verbraken, CCL, 144 (Turnhout, 1963); Gregory I, *Dialogi*, ed. A. de Vogüé, trans. P. Antin, Sources chrétiennes, 251, 260, 265 (Paris, 1978–1980); *idem, Homiliae in Evangelia*, ed. R. Etaix, CCL, 141 (Turnhout, 1999); *idem, Homiliae in Hiezechibelem prophetam*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCL, 142 (Turnhout, 1971); *idem, Moralia in Job*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCL, 143, 143A, 143B (Turnhout, 1979–1985); *idem, Regula pastoralis*, ed. F. Rommel, trans. C. Morel, Sources chrétiennes, 381–382 (Paris, 1992). I take it for granted that the *Dialogues* were written by Gregory I. See P. Meyvaert, "The Authentic Dialogues of Gregory the Great," in *Sacris erudiri*, 43 (2004), 55–130.

¹³⁵ Maximus the Confessor, *La mystagogie de Saint Maxime le Confesseur*, ed. and trans. C. Sotiropoulos (Athens, 2001). In the main text of the book, I will refer to this work by its standard English transliteration, *Mystagogia*. For an introduction to Maximus, see J.C. Larchet, *Saint Maxime le confesseur (580–662)* (Paris, 2003).

¹³⁶ Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, ed. C.M. Lawson, CCL, 113 (Turnhout, 1989); *idem, Etymologiae*, ed. W.M. Lindsay, 2 vols (Oxford, 1911). J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville: genèse et originalité de la culture hispanique au temps des Wisigoths* (Turnhout, 2000); *idem*, "Isidor IV (von Sevilla)," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 18 (1998), 1002–1027. Especially for Isidore's ideas on the liturgy, see P. Séjourné, "Saint Isidore de Séville et la liturgie wisigothique," in *Miscellanea Isidoriana: homenaje a S. Isidoro de Sevilla en el XII centenario de su muerte* (Rome, 1936), 221–51.

¹³⁷ *Anastasii Sinaitae Quaestiones et responsiones*, ed. M. Richard and J.A. Munitiz, Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca, 59 (Turnhout, 2006); J. Haldon, "The Works of Anastasius of Sinai: A Key Source for the History of the Seventh-Century East Mediterranean Society and Belief," in *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East*, ed. A. Cameron and L.I. Conrad (Princeton, 1992), 107–47.

the former monk and patriarch of Antioch from 599–609, tells us about the laity's behavior at Mass.¹³⁸ Anastasius II corresponded with Gregory I and translated his *Pastoral Rule* into Greek.¹³⁹ Amalar of Metz (c.775–c.850) – a cleric active in the Frankish royal court, and the archbishop of Trier (804–814) and Lyons (835–838/9) – composed allegorical writings on the liturgy that show how Roman liturgical practices could be reinterpreted in a new cultural context.¹⁴⁰

Moving beyond written sources significantly increases insight into the mundane realities experienced by those who wrote and lived the liturgies under study. Richard Krautheimer's work highlighted the importance of knowing the physical conditions of Rome throughout its centuries of existence in order to know its history.¹⁴¹ There is a guide to understanding the topography of the eternal city,¹⁴² and a map of the major features of its streets.¹⁴³ Monumental evidence, especially that of Rome's many churches, is critical for comprehending how liturgies were designed against the backdrop of the city.¹⁴⁴ To understand the interaction between architecture and liturgy, one must know the layout of the churches.¹⁴⁵ Archaeology has increasingly proved to be a useful tool in

¹³⁸ H.G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich*, 2nd edn (Munich, 1977), 401; R. Devreesse, *Le patriarcat d'Antioche, depuis la paix de l'église jusqu'à la conquête arabe* (Paris, 1945), 100, 119. For his sermon, see *Oratio de sacra synaxi in PG*, lxxxix, 825–49. For the attribution, see S.N. Sakkos, *Peri Anastasiōn Sinaïtōn* (Thessalonika, 1964), 133–6.

¹³⁹ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 685–7.

¹⁴⁰ Amalar of Metz, *Amalarii episcopi opera liturgica omnia*, ed. J.M. Hanssens, *Studi e testi*, 138–40 (Vatican City, 1948–1950). For background on Amalar, see A. Cabaniss, *Amalaricus of Metz* (Amsterdam, 1954). On Amalar's method, see A. Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter*, 339–98; H. Schneider, "Roman Liturgy and Frankish Allegory," in *Early Medieval Rome*, 341–79.

¹⁴¹ Krautheimer, *Rome*.

¹⁴² *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae*, ed. E.M. Steinby, 6 vols (Rome, 1993–2000); for the extramural space, see *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae: Suburbium*, ed. A. La Regina, 5 vols (Rome, 2001–2008). Still worthwhile to navigate the medieval city is U. Gnoli, *Topografia e toponomastica di Roma medioevale e moderna* (Foligno, 1984).

¹⁴³ R. Lanciani, *Forma Urbis Romae* (Rome: Quasar, 1990 [1893–1901]).

¹⁴⁴ R. Krautheimer, *Corpus basilicarum christianorum Romae*, 5 vols (Vatican City, 1937–1977); and for a summary of recent developments, *Ecclesiae Urbis – Atti del Convegno internazionale di Studi sulle chiese di Roma (IV–X secolo)*, ed. F. Guidobaldi and A.G. Guidobaldi (Vatican City, 2002). See too R. Coates-Stephens, "Dark Age Architecture in Rome," *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 65 (1997), 177–232.

¹⁴⁵ S. de Blaauw, "Architecture and Liturgy in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Traditions and Trends in Modern Scholarship," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 33 (1991), 1–34; R.E. Reynolds, "Liturgy and the Monument," in *Artistic Integration in Gothic Buildings*, ed. V.C. Raguin, K. Brush, and P. Draper (Toronto, 1995), 57–68.

understanding the medieval past.¹⁴⁶ Eighteen recently excavated sites are of interest to scholars of late antique and early medieval Rome,¹⁴⁷ especially the remarkable finds at Crypta Balbi.¹⁴⁸ Frescoes and mosaics that survive from this period are telling indicators of mentalities, and can sometimes preserve images of liturgical vestments and furniture.¹⁴⁹

A final note should be made about the kind of approach I undertake in this book. Although most of the research in this volume is rooted in my training as a historian, I occasionally stray outside of history when other disciplines can help to inform this story. I use the study of anthropology, and especially its focus on ritual, for its comparative value. This kind of borrowing has a long and fruitful past in medieval history,¹⁵⁰ and, at least when used in moderation, should prove relatively uncontroversial.¹⁵¹ Less familiar will be reference at one point to biology. Several scholars posit that social activity, and especially ritual behavior, may have biological roots.¹⁵² Ritual and its physical repercussions are suitable for cross-cultural study. It has been estimated that 3,500 cultures demonstrate similar altered states of consciousness produced by social, environmental, and

¹⁴⁶ For Italy in this period, see N. Christie, *From Constantine to Charlemagne: An Archaeology of Italy AD 300–800* (Aldershot and Burlington, VT, 2006).

¹⁴⁷ A good overview of the current state of Roman archaeology is Meneghini and Santangeli Valenziani, *Roma nell'Altimedioevo*. For a more detailed catalogue and discussion of recent findings, see *Roma dall'antichità al medioevo; Roma dall'antichità al medioevo II*.

¹⁴⁸ See the above note, and also D. Manacorda, *Crypta Balbi: Archeologia e storia di un paesaggio urbano* (Milan, 2003).

¹⁴⁹ See especially the series *La pittura medievale a Roma, 312–1431: corpus e atlante* (Milan, 2006–), the projected second volume of which will deal with the seventh and eighth centuries; Ihm, *Die Programme*.

¹⁵⁰ See, for example, C. Klapisch-Zuber, “Les femmes dans les rituels de l’alliance et de la naissance à Florence,” in *Riti e rituali nelle società medievali*, ed. J. Chiffolleau, L. Martines, and A.P. Bagliani (Spoleto, 1994), 3–22; G. Koziol, *Begging Pardon and Favor: Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca, NY, 1992); J. Le Goff, “Le rituel symbolique de la vassalité,” in *Simboli e Simbologia nell’alto Medioevo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull’alto Medioevo, 23, 2 vols (Spoleto, 1976), ii, 679–788 and reprinted in *idem, Pour un autre Moyen Age: temps, travail et culture en Occident: 18 essais* (Paris, 1977), 349–420.

¹⁵¹ Although I am aware of the criticism of P. Buc, *The Dangers of Ritual: Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory* (Princeton, NJ, 2001), I am not prepared to abandon the concept of ritual. For discussions of this book, see G. Koziol, “The Dangers of Polemic: Is Ritual Still an Interesting Topic of Historical Study?” *Early Medieval Europe*, 11 (2002), 367–88, at 368–77, and the review of J. Nelson in *Speculum*, 78 (2003), 847–51.

¹⁵² E.O. Wilson, *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis* (Cambridge, MA, 2000 [1975]), esp. 547–75; A. Neher, *The Psychology of Transcendence* (New York, 1990).

biological factors resulting from ritual.¹⁵³ Many of the social and biological preconditions are found in the liturgy, such as fasting, chanting, sensory deprivation, mortification, exposure to certain drugs, abstinence from sex, mental stress, and illness. The interaction of these and other factors can trigger the dominance of the parasympathetic nervous system and a concomitant trance state, which, though presented within culturally specific patterns, produces a standard effect on the brain.¹⁵⁴ The application of biology to the sources has only started in medieval history,¹⁵⁵ and it is difficult to predict how well established it will become. I offer this component of my argument in the spirit of exploration, but for those who remain wary, it can be safely ignored without sacrificing the rest of the argument.

¹⁵³ E. Bourguignon, *Religion, Altered States of Consciousness, and Social Change* (Columbus, OH, 1973). Bourguignon argued for the cross-cultural relevance of altered states research, and provides case studies to show their recurrence in disparate cultures. For a concise overview of this research and its implications, see R.G. Locke and E.F. Kelly, "A Preliminary Model for the Cross-Cultural Analysis of Altered States of Consciousness," *Ethos*, 13 (1985), 3–55.

¹⁵⁴ M. Winkelman, "Trance States: A Theoretical Model and Cross-Cultural Analysis," *Ethos* 14 (1986), 174–203.

¹⁵⁵ J. Kroll and B.S. Bachrach, "Medieval Dynastic Decisions: Evolutionary Biology and Historical Explanation," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 21 (1990), 1–28; *idem*, "[Sociobiology and Human Social Behavior]: A Reply," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 23 (1993), 854–7. See also the reconstruction of Byzantine monastic life at Saint Stephen in Jerusalem: M.S. Driscoll and S.G. Sheridan, "Every Knee Shall Bend: A Biocultural Reconstruction of Liturgical and Ascetical Prayer in V–VII Century Palestine," *Worship*, 74 (2000), 453–68.

Chapter 1

Mass in Early Medieval Rome

Introduction

The liturgy that illustrates the most about Roman society, and that which will form the basis of the discussion in this chapter, is the Mass.¹ The Mass was a complex Christian worship service led by the clergy, which combined chanting, readings, prayers, and ritual action – above all, the blessing of bread and wine. The name “Mass” (Latin *missa*) derives from *missio*, a term meaning “dismissal” that originally had juridical and military connotations.² The Mass at Rome, as in several prominent cities in Late Antiquity like Jerusalem and Constantinople, was incorporated into what is known as a stationary liturgy. Stationary liturgies were led by the bishop or his representative, moved throughout the city, were performed in different churches depending on the feast celebrated, and represented the primary feast of the city.³ The bishop of the city of Rome, the pope, was the presiding minister in the performance of the Mass, but he was accompanied by an extensive entourage. The series of Masses celebrated around the city constituted a busy calendar for the pope and his representatives. The papal sacramentary, or prayer book, has 189 formulae for independent Masses.⁴ Even if another bishop would at times substitute for the pope⁵ (or if, unusually, a Mass was cancelled), this was still a considerable number of Masses in the course of the year and would have been crucial for the papacy’s public presentation.

Since the late-seventeenth century, scholars have been producing critical editions of the papal Mass contained in the first extant Mass liturgy, the First Roman Ordo (ORI), and reconstructing its form. This task has proved difficult, with no definitive critical edition until that of Michel Andrieu.⁶ Even after

¹ The standard work for the history of the Mass is still Jungmann, *MS*, though a helpful recent survey is E. Foley, *From Age to Age: How Christians Have Celebrated the Eucharist*, revised edn (Collegeville, MN, 2008), esp. 78–130. See also J. Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century: A Historical Introduction and Guide for Students and Musicians* (Oxford and New York, 1991), 109–126.

² *L'ordinaire*, 145–9. *Missa* is preserved in the Latin words of dismissal, *Ite missa est*.

³ J.F. Baldwin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development and Meaning of Stationary Liturgy*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 228 (Rome, 1987).

⁴ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 8–14, 85–348.

⁵ ORI II in *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 115.

⁶ *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 65–108.

Andrieu's labors, not all of the questions about OR I have been answered.⁷ I have addressed these issues elsewhere,⁸ but as an aid to the reader, I have included in Appendix 2 a presentation of OR I that I find as close to the Roman original as possible alongside an English translation. Although I will discuss aspects of the papal Mass as relevant to my argument, it is not my intention to reconstruct it in detail.⁹

While more work is needed to understand the form of the Mass, few have ventured into the implications of the Mass beyond the experience of worship. In this chapter I will begin to examine the relationship between liturgy and the functioning of the rest of Roman society, whether clerical or lay. The majority of evidence will come from OR I, but I will supplement it with contemporary sources. I argue that the worship that took place inside churches was inextricably linked to the world outside them. To prove this, I provide an analytical description of the Mass, focusing on its visual and aural aspects. Next, I will demonstrate the part of the laity in them, a role that is modest but nevertheless more extensive than is often supposed. Finally, I suggest how the papal Mass was received by the Roman populace.

One considerable conceptual difficulty occurs at the outset of this inquiry. Can one even refer to the Mass celebrated in the city of Rome as being authentically Roman at all? A long line of historiography characterizes the city of Rome in the seventh and eighth centuries as an imitator of or captive to influences from the Byzantine world.¹⁰ This trend supposedly pervaded Roman

⁷ See the review of vol. iv of *Les Ordines Romani* by S.J.P. Van Dijk, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S. 8 (1957), 351–3.

⁸ J.F. Romano, "The Fates of Liturgies: Towards a History of the First Roman Ordo," *Antiphon*, 11 (2007), 43–77.

⁹ For a complete overview of the papal Mass of OR I, see Appendix 4.

¹⁰ A recent proponent of this view is A.J. Ekonomou, *Byzantine Rome and the Greek Popes: Eastern Influences on Rome and the Papacy from Gregory the Great to Zacharias, A.D. 590–752* (Lanham, 2007), although see the review by T.F.X. Noble in *The Journal of Religion*, 90 (2010), 573–5. For his view of "liturgical byzantinization," see 164–6, a view supported not by comparison with contemporary Byzantine documents but with the tenth-century Book of Ceremonies. In these pages, Ekonomou makes several errors that undercut his points. He refers to the discredited theory that OR XV was a Roman document composed in the late-seventh century by an "archchanter" John (cf. C. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. and rev. W.G. Storey and N.K. Rasmussen [Washington, DC, 1986], 142, 202–203). Pope Vitalian (657–672) may have had a part in the establishment of the *schola cantorum*, but (as he notes) this tradition is based upon a late-ninth-century source, and no other evidence suggests that he had such a central role in the liturgy. Ekonomou claims that Gregory I was "impervious to Eastern ecclesiastical practices" (165), although Gregory said that he was prepared to imitate the church of Constantinople (or another church) if they had a worthy liturgical practice. On the last point, see my discussion below.

society, but perhaps found its greatest manifestation in the liturgy. Many scholars have spoken about ORI as a “Byzantine,” Greek, or Eastern liturgy.¹¹ The logical inference is that the papal Mass may belong more naturally in a discussion of the broader Byzantine world or the imperial city Constantinople rather than considered in the context of Roman society.

Scholars have been dismantling piece by piece the idea that Rome was merely an imitator of Constantinople or a pseudo-Byzantine backwater. Roman popes, even those who came from the Eastern world or were native Greek speakers, were thoroughly Romanized and pursued policies that were advantageous to the papacy and the city, not the Byzantine emperor.¹² Scholars today tend to doubt that there was a period of Byzantine domination in Roman architecture, where Richard Krautheimer claimed to find telling examples of pervasive Eastern influence in Rome.¹³ The artwork that was produced in Rome in this period, especially Santa Maria Antiqua in the Roman Forum, cannot be seen as borrowed uncritically from Byzantine models but instead are better interpreted

¹¹ Among the myriad examples, see A. Angenendt, *Das Frühmittelalter: die abendländische Christenheit von 400 bis 900* (Stuttgart, 1990), 247–50; F.A. Bauer, “The Liturgical Arrangement of Early Medieval Roman Church Buildings,” in *Atti del colloquio internazionale: Arredi di culto e disposizioni liturgiche a Roma da Costantino a Sisto IV* (Istituto Olandese a Roma, 3–4 dicembre 1999), *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome, Historical Studies*, 59 (2000) (Rome, 2001), 101–28, at 117; L. Duchesne, “Les régions de Rome au moyen-âge,” *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'école française de Rome*, 10 (1890), 126–49, at 129; Jungmann, *MS*, i, 90–93, 97; T. Klauser, *A Short History of the Western Liturgy: An Account and Some Reflections*, trans. J. Halliburton (London, 1969), 63; P. Llewellyn, *Rome in the Dark Ages* (London, 1971), 126; T.F. Mathews, *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy* (University Park, PA and London, 1971), 107, 111, 142–4, 150, 156; J. McKinnon, *The Advent Project: The Later-seventh-century Creation of the Roman Mass Proper* (Berkeley, 2000), 370–72; J. Richards, *The Popes and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages*, 476–752 (London and Boston, 1979), 279–80; V. Saxer, *Sainte-Marie-Majeure: une basilique de Rome dans l'histoire de la ville et de son église, V^e–XIII^e siècle* (Rome, 2001), 118–19, 126–7; B. Schimmelpennig, *Das Papsttum: Von der Antike bis zur Renaissance*, 4th edn (Darmstadt, 1996), 63; F.C. Senn, *Christian Liturgy: Catholic and Evangelical* (Minneapolis, MN, 1997), 184; S.J.P. Van Dijk, “Recent Developments in the Study of the Old-Roman Rite,” in *Studia patristica*, 8, ed. F.L. Cross, *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der althristlichen Literatur*, 93 (Berlin, 1966), 299–319, at 302, 305, 315–18; H.A.J. Wegman, *Liturgie in der Geschichte des Christentums* (Regensburg, 1994), 229.

¹² T.F.X. Noble, *The Republic of St. Peter: The Birth of the Papal State, 680–825* (Philadelphia, 1984), 185–8.

¹³ V. Pace, “La ‘*Felix culpa*’ di Richard Krautheimer: Roma, Santa Prassede e la ‘Rinascenza Carolingia,’” in *Ecclesiae Urbis – Atti del Convegno internazionale di Studi sulle chiese di Roma (IV–X secolo)*, ed. F. Guidobaldi and A.G. Guidobaldi, 3 vols (Vatican City, 2002), i, 65–72.

as local Roman productions.¹⁴ Saying this is not to deny the legitimate and strong ties between Rome or Italy and the Byzantine world, politically and culturally.¹⁵ Nor is it to ignore the significant population of Greek speakers in Rome in the seventh century. But seeing Roman society as an epigone of Byzantine culture or controlled by the Byzantine emperor does not do justice to its independent existence.

One must use special care when speaking about the origin of Roman liturgical practices. In the late-sixth century, certain contemporaries thought that the Roman Church had copied the practices of Constantinople, a charge that Gregory I (590–604) was anxious to refute – not because he refused to imitate another church's meritorious liturgical practices, but so as not to give anyone reason to suspect that the see of Constantinople had precedence over Rome.¹⁶ The assumption of modern critics seems to be no different: that the Roman Church consciously copied the practices of the East, perhaps even to rival the imperial court.¹⁷ One scholar even suggested that the emperor granted the pope permission to perform certain aspects of the liturgy.¹⁸ While individual liturgical practices may find their roots in the imperial court in Constantinople, it seems to me questionable to claim that the liturgy as a whole is Byzantine or Eastern. Both Rome and Constantinople were joint inheritors of the ceremonial practices of the later Roman Empire.¹⁹ Some of the customs in papal liturgy are demonstrably earlier than the foundation of the imperial court in Constantinople: carrying lights in front of Roman magistrates and using incense as part of cultic practices were long-standing in Roman Antiquity, especially in

¹⁴ L. Brubacker, "100 Years of Solitude: Santa Maria Antiqua and the History of Byzantine Art History," in *Santa Maria Antiqua al Foro Romano cento anni dopo: atti del colloquio internazionale, Roma, 5–6 maggio 2000*, ed. J. Osborne, J. Rasmus Brandt, and G. Morganti (Rome, 2004), 41–7.

¹⁵ M. McCormick, "Byzantium and the West, 700–900," in *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Volume 2, c. 700–c. 900*, ed. R. McKitterick (Cambridge, 1995), 349–80.

¹⁶ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 586–7. The best article on this letter is still E. Wellesz, "Gregory the Great's Letter on the *Alleluia*," in *Annales musicologiques*, 2 (1954), 7–26.

¹⁷ For example, T.F.X. Noble, "Rome in the Seventh Century," in *Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies on his Life and Influence*, ed. M. Lapidge (Cambridge, 2005), 68–87, at 82.

¹⁸ E.G.C.F. Atchley, *Ordo Romanus Primus* (London, 1905), 12–13, on the pope's supposedly being given permission by the emperor to use candles and incense.

¹⁹ T.F. Mathews, *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1971), 142–3. In comparing the entrance ceremonies of the emperor in Constantinople and the pope in Rome, Mathews argues that the ultimate source for this practice in the imperial city is the city of Rome, but more immediately, both had late antique roots. Cf. Baldovin, *Urban Character*, who argues that stational liturgies simultaneously developed in many late Roman cities.

emperor worship.²⁰ Rather than copying from Constantinople, it is possible that both Rome and Constantinople drew inspiration from similar sources. Owing to the lack of sources, one can only hypothesize about the possible origins of liturgical practices. Labeling any liturgy as Byzantine or Western verges on essentializing in the absence of concrete sources upon which to base claims of origin. As a result, I will consider the Roman Mass to be indigenous to the city.

Visual Appearance of the Mass

The Roman Mass was a multimedia event that was calibrated to impress contemporaries. It combined a sumptuous visual presentation of impressive actions, vestments, architecture, artwork, and liturgical furnishings with readings and music to appeal to the ear. This vibrant combination would have been important to capture and keep people's attention during this three-hour Mass,²¹ and this may be the reason for the continuous flow of motion and gesture.²² The main action of the Mass occurs in a few significant movements, which can be briefly summarized here.²³ The pope and the clergy traveled in the morning in a procession from their home base, the Lateran, to the station church.²⁴ After having been vested in a building to the side of the church, the pope again walked in a procession, now to the altar.²⁵ A series of chants, readings, and prayers followed.²⁶ The clergy then received bread and wine from representatives of the laity and the clergy and prepared the altar for the celebration of the Eucharist.²⁷ The pope, flanked by members of the clergy, then

²⁰ A. Alföldi, *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche* (Darmstadt, 1970), 111–18; P. Batiffol, *Leçons sur la messe*, 4th edn (Paris, 1919), 75–6; S. de Blaauw, *Cultus et decor: Liturgia e architettura nella Roma tardoantica e medievale*, Studi e Testi, 355–6, 2 vols (Vatican City, 1994), i, 141; Jungmann, *MS*, i, 410, 570–71.

²¹ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 840–42.

²² C. Cibien, “Gestes,” in *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de la liturgie*, ed. D. Sartore and A.M. Triacca, 2 vols (Turnhout, 1992), i, 511–21; *L'Eglise en prière: Introduction à la liturgie*, ed. Aimé-Georges et al. (Paris, 1961), 296; R.D. McCall, *Do This: Liturgy as Performance* (Notre Dame, IN, 2007), 125–6.

²³ The Mass of OR I has been summarized in a number of places, notably Batiffol, *Leçons*, 65–99; L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien: Etude sur la liturgie latine avant Charlemagne*, 5th edn (Paris, 1925), 153–8, 171–99, 511–12, 370, 415–19; Jungmann, *MS*, i, 63–137; Klauser, *Short*, 59–72; and G.G. Willis, *A History of Early Roman Liturgy to the Death of Pope Gregory the Great* (London and Rochester, 1994), 72–7.

²⁴ OR I:7–28.

²⁵ OR I:29–49.

²⁶ OR I:50–65.

²⁷ OR I:67–87.

said the most sacred prayers of the Mass known as the Canon.²⁸ The consecrated bread and wine were distributed to the clergy and the lay faithful.²⁹ Finally, there would be a dismissal and the pope and some of the clergy would recess out of the church.³⁰

Papal Masses took place inside the stational churches.³¹ These places of worship were generally imposing structures, and, in comparison with the crumbling ancient monuments, would have been well maintained in part for use in liturgies.³² Approximately 38 churches were involved in the stational system, and their position had been standardized since at least the seventh century.³³ Of these, San Pietro in Vaticano, Santa Maria Maggiore, San Paolo fuori le Mura, San Lorenzo fuori le Mura, Basilica of the Savior (today San Giovanni in Laterano), and Santi XII Apostoli were frequently the setting of papal Masses, and all of them featured in the sacred ceremonies close to or on the feast of Easter.³⁴ The stational system had grown up haphazardly, but once in place it became hallowed by tradition and the clergy in each church considered

²⁸ OR I:88–97.

²⁹ OR I:101–122.

³⁰ OR I:124–6.

³¹ The classic work on the city is R. Krautheimer, *Rome: Profile of a City, 312–1308*, foreword by M. Trachtenberg (Princeton, 2000 [1980]), and it still contains many insights even if challenged in many of its particulars. A worthwhile overview of churches is H. Brandenburg, *Ancient Churches of Rome from the Fourth to the Seventh Century: The Dawn of Christian Architecture in the West*, trans. A. Kropp (Turnhout, 2005). An idiosyncratic but compelling introduction to the art and architecture of the city is M.G. Sindell, *Mosaics in the Eternal City* (Tempe, 2007).

³² R. Coates-Stephens, “Dark Age Architecture in Rome,” *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 65 (1997), 177–232, at 202; B. Ward-Perkins, *From Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages: Urban Public Building in Northern and Central Italy, AD 300–850* (Oxford and New York, 1984), 60–65.

³³ For the stations in this period, see G.G. Willis, *Further Essays in Early Roman Liturgy* (London, 1968), esp. 21–32, 53–77, 86–7.

³⁴ R. Krautheimer, *Corpus basilicarum christianorum Romae*, 5 vols (Vatican City, 1937–1977), i, part 2, 76–81 (Santi XII Apostoli); ii, 1–144 (San Lorenzo fuori le Mura); iii, 1–60 (Santa Maria Maggiore); v, 1–92 (Basilica of the Savior); v, 93–164 (San Paolo fuori le Mura); v, 165–286 (San Pietro in Vaticano). Blaauw, *Cultus et decor* (for the Basilica of the Savior, Santa Maria Maggiore, and San Pietro in Vaticano; for reconstructions of these churches see his appendix, esp. figures 1–2, 12, 19, 24); *Il complesso dei SS. Apostoli: interventi di restauro*, ed. C. Arcieri (Rome, 1992); G. Matthiae, *San Lorenzo fuori le mura*, Le chiese di Roma illustrate, 89 (Rome, 1966); *La Basilica di San Pietro*, ed. C. Pietrangeli, Chiese monumentali d’Italia (Florence, 1989); *San Giovanni in Laterano*, ed. C. Pietrangeli, Chiese monumentali d’Italia (Florence, 1990); *Santa Maria Maggiore a Roma*, ed. C. Pietrangeli, Chiese monumentali d’Italia (Florence, 1988), 19–50; E. Zocca, *La basilica de S.S. Apostoli in Roma* (Rome, 1959).

it their right to host the pope's Mass on a scheduled day. Initially the stational system may have been a "pastoral" decision intended to facilitate the access of the faithful to papal Masses.³⁵ However, even as the population of the city of Rome clustered inside the Roman Forum,³⁶ the stational churches remained fixed largely as they had been in the fifth century. This meant worshippers would have to travel considerable distances to far-flung churches like the Basilica of the Savior, San Lorenzo fuori le Mura, and San Paolo fuori le Mura.

The architecture of Roman churches has considerable importance for an understanding of the liturgy. The architecture was geared towards focusing attention on the celebration of the Mass. As was typical in Antiquity, there was only one altar in the churches of Rome.³⁷ There was less ornamentation in the churches than in later centuries, and thus less "fragmentation" of the liturgical space.³⁸ Architecture was further designed to guard people and things. The pope and the clergy who accompanied him walked up the central nave on the *solea*, which was slightly upraised from the pavement in the rest of the church and protected by a partition constructed of marble or brick on both sides; it extended midway down the nave.³⁹ The barrier kept the path clear, and would have provided the pope an extra measure of protection from the crowds who attended the Mass. There may also have been a liturgical rationale: these passageways were probably constructed to accommodate the entrance procession and the introit chanted during it.⁴⁰ At the end of this passage was a sacred area in which the main liturgical actions of the Mass were performed.⁴¹

³⁵ R. Vielliard, *Recherches sur les origines de la Rome chrétienne* (Rome, 1959); A. Chavasse, "L'organisation stationale du Carême romain, avant le VIII^e siècle: Une organisation 'pastorale,'" *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 56 (1982), 17–32. This may also be what J. Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom* (Princeton, 1989), 126, had in mind when she argued that the stational liturgies showed papal concern for the populace of Rome.

³⁶ R. Meneghini and R. Santangeli Valenziani, *Roma nell'Altomedioevo: Topografia e urbanistica della città dal V al X secolo* (Rome, 2004), 157–88.

³⁷ Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 118; J. Braun, *Der christliche Altar in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, 2 vols (Munich, 1924), i, 368.

³⁸ F.A. Bauer, "La frammentazione liturgica nella chiesa romana del primo medioevo," *Rivista di archeologia Cristiana*, 75 (1999), 385–446.

³⁹ Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 127–9; V. Saxer, "Recinzioni liturgiche secondo le fonti letterarie," in *Atti del colloquio internazionale: Arredi di culto*, 71–9; F. Guidobaldi, "Struttura e cronologia delle recinzioni liturgiche nelle chiese di Roma dal VI al IX secolo," in *ibid.*, 81–99; *idem*, "Strutture liturgiche negli edifici cristiani di Roma dal IV al VI secolo," in *Materiali e tecniche dell'edilizia paleocristiana a Roma*, ed. M. Cecchelli (Rome, 2001), 171–90, at 184–90.

⁴⁰ J. Dyer, "Psalms ante sacrificium and the Origin of the Introit," *Plainsong and Medieval Music*, 20 (2011), 91–121, at 109–114.

⁴¹ For a reconstruction of this area in San Pietro in Vaticano, see J. Toynbee and J.W. Perkins, *The Shrine of St. Peter and the Vatican Excavations* (London, New York, and

This was entered by means of a gate named the *ruga*, which was watched over by acolytes.⁴² The enclosed chancel in Roman churches, which extended slightly into the nave, was known as the *presbiterium* (presbytery).⁴³ The barrier and chancel, in addition to physically marking out the clergy and their actions as sacred, separated them from the faithful who attended services. Only in rare exceptions were the laity allowed in this section.⁴⁴

The area to the north of the presbytery was the altar region.⁴⁵ The altar was a fundamental part of the structure of every church, and the center of worship.⁴⁶ OR I makes constant reference to the areas at, in front of, and behind⁴⁷ the altar.⁴⁸ The altar region was not strictly limited to the major clergy; the minor clergy could enter it.⁴⁹ The altar itself was a flat-topped, isolated, elevated block.⁵⁰ Unique among the churches of Rome, the Basilica of the Savior had in front of its altar the *fastigium*, a pediment supported by four bronze columns that was

Toronto, 1956), 215; for a slightly revised version of this reconstruction, see R. Krautheimer, *Corpus basilicarum*, v, 260; and for a different reconstruction of the presbytery in San Pietro, see U.M. Fasola, *Pietro e Paolo a Roma* (Rome, 1980), 124–5. For a reconstruction of this area in Santa Maria Maggiore, see Saxer, *Sainte-Marie-Majeure*, 37.

⁴² OR I:126. For the view of *ruga* as a gate or grill, see Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 76; Krautheimer, *Corpus basilicarum*, iii, 6–7; T.F. Mathews, “An Early Roman Chancel Arrangement and its Liturgical Functions,” *Rivista di archeologia Cristiana*, 38 (1962), 73–95, at 78. The proof of this interpretation is in the *Liber pontificalis*: the *rugae* are made out of silver, which is unlikely to have paved the floor of Roman churches. See LP (Duchesne), i, 443, 464, 478 and ii, 2, 8–10, 12–14, 16–18, 26, 29, 33.

⁴³ OR I:24, 28, 31, 42, 88, 118, 126 (twice). As E. De Benedictis, “The ‘Schola Cantorum’ in Rome during the High Middle Ages” (Bryn Mawr College, 1983), esp. 9–55, argued, the *schola cantorum* or “choir” did not exist in early medieval churches; the enclosed nave chancel was the presbytery. In OR I, the word “schola” or phrase “schola cantorum” refer exclusively to the papal choir; they are not architectural terms.

⁴⁴ For example, the *draconarius* soldiers are allowed inside the presbytery in OR I:126, seemingly to serve as bodyguards for the clergy.

⁴⁵ OR I:28, 29, 31 (twice), 43, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51 (twice), 55 (twice), 59, 67 (twice), 74, 77 (twice), 78, 79, 82 (twice), 84 (threetimes), 85, 87, 92, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102, 105, 108, 109, 110, 123.

⁴⁶ Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 84.

⁴⁷ That is, *retro altare* (OR I:87). This section is in back of the altar on the clergy’s side, but set further back than the region immediately in front of (*ad*) the altar. *Ante* is used if one is in front of the altar (i.e. on the side of the faithful), and *retro* if behind the altar.

⁴⁸ *Ad altare*: OR I:28, 29, 55, 67, 74, 77, 82, 85, 98, 109, 123. In OR I:49 the pope is bowing his head *to* the altar; he is still in the presbytery. *Ante altare*: OR I:31, 43, 46, 47, 50, 59, 77, 92. Cf. OR I:42–3, the first three members of the *schola* are first in the presbytery, and then must move in front of the altar (*ante altare*); and OR I:28, the pope ascends to the altar (*ad altare ascendit*).

⁴⁹ For instance, regionary subdeacons (OR I:55), acolytes (OR I:28, 31, 67), and an attendant subdeacon (OR I:31).

⁵⁰ OR I:109; Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 84.

originally erected by the fourth-century emperor Constantine and continued to have imperial associations.⁵¹

Either within, below, or near the altar in some Roman churches was a *confessio*: this was a niche or larger subterranean space that housed relics or a venerated tomb.⁵² These were ornamented with silver and gold, both on the inside and outside.⁵³ The *confessio* served as a topographical marker in OR I.⁵⁴ In churches like San Pietro in Vaticano and San Paolo fuori le Mura, in which the altars were placed directly over the *confessiones*,⁵⁵ the celebrants sang the Mass over the bodies of the saints. The *confessio* was thought to be a locus of great power,⁵⁶ and an appropriate spot to issue decrees and hold councils.⁵⁷ People considered the *confessio* so sacred that, after it was cleaned in a special rite known as the *diligentia*, people would take the sponges used in the ritual and treat them as relics.⁵⁸

The architecture helped not only to protect the clergy, but marked out the societal distinction between clergy and laity as well as distinctions within each group. The curved recess to the north of the altar area is the apse of the church. On the semicircular wall of the apse were benches, with the bishops seated on the pope's right and priests to his left.⁵⁹ At the apex of the apse the pope's chair would be placed so that he was directly facing the altar.⁶⁰ The apse, which included the pope's seat, was elevated above the pavement of the church. This

⁵¹ Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 119–27; *idem*, “Das Fastigium der Lateranbasilika: Schöpferische Innovation, Unikat oder Paradigma?” in *Innovation in der Spätantike: Kolloquium Basel 6. und 7. Mai 1994*, ed. B. Brenk (Wiesbaden, 1996), 53–65; *idem*, “Imperial Connotations in Roman Church Interiors: The Significance and Effect of the Lateran *Fastigium*,” in *Acta ad Archaeologiam et Artium Historiam pertinentia*, 15/N. S. 1 (2001), 137–46.

⁵² Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 84; Braun, *Der christliche Altar*, 66–86, 192–207; R. Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*, 4th edn (New Haven, 1986), 517. The *confessio* is mentioned once in OR I:74.

⁵³ Braun, *Der christliche Altar*, 563–5.

⁵⁴ Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 84.

⁵⁵ LP (Mommsen), 162; Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, ii, 533–4.

⁵⁶ Cf. LP (Geertman), 234, in which Boniface II (530–532) swore an oath and invalidated an old decree in front of the *confessio* (*ante confessionem*) of San Pietro in Vaticano; and a letter of Honorius I (625–638), in which he says he would confer a pallium to the newly consecrated bishop of Nicopolis if he swore at the *confessio* of San Pietro his innocence in the murder of his predecessor (PL, lxxx, 478A–B). These examples show the power of the area in front of the *confessio*: St Peter was the one who guaranteed oaths.

⁵⁷ LP (Duchesne), i, 415–16.

⁵⁸ OR XLIV:18 (*Les Ordines Romani*, iv, 433).

⁵⁹ Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 84; Mathews, “Early Roman Chancel,” 75. Cf. LP (Duchesne), i, 218.

⁶⁰ Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 80–81.

explains why the pope is described as descending from his Chair in OR I.⁶¹ In OR I the pope's seat is portable and transported from the Lateran. It is referred to as the Chair – either *sedes*⁶² or *sella*.⁶³ The use of the term *sedes apostolica* by the pope from the fourth century was used to express Rome's exalted position among churches, and the spiritual and political authority of the papacy.⁶⁴ Either noun for seat in OR I always refers to the pope's Chair, since he is the only individual granted the honor of his own seat in the entire church. This seat at the highly visible apex of the apse is a papal privilege.⁶⁵ The only other people who sat during the Mass were the bishops and priests, who sat on their benches.⁶⁶ The rest of the congregation stood for the entire Mass,⁶⁷ an arrangement that may, in part, have been influenced by the ancient Roman custom of standing in all public assemblies and elections.⁶⁸

Men and women were separated in Roman churches, with the men on the right side of the pope's seat and the women on the left.⁶⁹ This gender separation sometimes corresponded to the artwork that appeared on the respective sides.⁷⁰ The elite men of Roman society were in a special section known as the *senatorium*. The comparable section for women was known as the *pars* or *partes mulierum*.⁷¹ These sections were culturally determined: there was no architectural enclosure around them.⁷² The *senatorium* and *pars mulierum* were located on either side

⁶¹ OR I:69, 74, 82, 113, 123, 126; Batiffol, *Leçons*, 86; Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 81.

⁶² OR I:51, 68, 76, 82, 98, 103, 106, 108, 113, 118, 119. See N. Gussone, *Thron und Inthronisation des Papstes von den Anfängen bis zum 12. Jahrhundert: zur Beziehung zwischen Herrschaftszeichen und bildhaften Begriffen, Recht und Liturgie im christlichen Verständnis von Wort und Wirklichkeit* (Bonn, 1978), 150, 156–8, 183–4. *Cathedra* was often used in place of *sedes* or *sella*, because of the possible pagan associations with the latter terms (Gussone, *Thron*, 51), but OR I does not use the term *cathedra*.

⁶³ OR I:23, 28, 29.

⁶⁴ Gussone, *Thron*, 90–110.

⁶⁵ Cf. OR II:2 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 115).

⁶⁶ OR I:24, 56.

⁶⁷ Batiffol, *Leçons*, 79; Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 83–4.

⁶⁸ J.P.V.D. Balsdon, *Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome* (New York, 1969), 255.

⁶⁹ OR I:115; F. Gandolfo, “La cattedra di Pasquale I in S. Maria Maggiore,” in *Roma e l'età carolingia: atti delle Giornate di studio, 3–8 maggio 1976*, ed. Istituto di storia dell'arte dell'Università di Roma (Rome, 1976), 55–67, at 59–60.

⁷⁰ C. Neuman de Vegvar, “Gendered Spaces: The Placement of Imagery in Santa Maria Maggiore,” in *Roma Felix: Formation and Reflections of Medieval Rome*, ed. É. Ó Carragain and C. Neuman de Vegvar (Aldershot and Burlington, VT, 2007), 97–111.

⁷¹ E. De Benedictis, “The Senatorium and Matroneum in the Early Roman Church,” *Rivista di archeologia Cristiana*, 57 (1981), 69–85. The *pars mulierum* of OR I is not the same thing as a *matroneum*.

⁷² De Benedictis, “The ‘Schola Cantorum,’” 14–15; McCall, *Do This*, 122–4.

of the altar region, roughly in line with the altar.⁷³ The rest of the church, where the majority of the populace attended Mass, did not have a special name. Other attendees would have been in the nave and, in the case of overcrowding, the side aisles (in churches that had them).

Within the station churches were expensive decorations and furnishings donated by popes and emperors.⁷⁴ The Church had assumed the love of gold in decoration that those in the ancient world relished, and its churches were filled with it.⁷⁵ Scholars only know about a portion of the artwork that would have been in the churches of Rome at the time. Some of the most famous include the fifth-century mosaics in the apse and nave of Santa Maria Maggiore that proclaimed God's fulfillment of his promises from the Old Testament to the birth of Jesus;⁷⁶ the seventh-century nave cycle in San Pietro in Vaticano that displayed the deeds of Peter;⁷⁷ and the fifth-century mosaics in the apse and triumphal arch of San Paolo fuori le Mura, showing respectively Jesus surrounded by saints and Jesus in the Second Coming with the elders of the Apocalypse.⁷⁸ A striking seventh-century addition to Rome's ecclesiastical artwork was the apse mosaic in Sant'Agnese fuori le Mura of St Agnes with Honorius I and another pope (if not a double image of Honorius) making offerings of the church and an evangelary to the martyr.⁷⁹ Painting would have been omnipresent in Roman churches.⁸⁰ The best existing program from this period are the extensive paintings from Santa Maria Antiqua in the Roman Forum.⁸¹ Three renowned

⁷³ OR I:69, 74; De Benedictis, "Senatorium," 71; Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 100–102; Gandolfo, "La cattedra," 59–60. This theory is preferable to the idea that the *senatorium* and *pars mulierum* were merely where the elite members of Roman society received Communion: pace Mathews, "Early Roman Chancel," 88–95.

⁷⁴ For example, for papal donations, LP (Mommsen), 161–2, 170–73, 176, 177, 180, 190, 192, 201, 203, 213–15, 217, 219; LP (Duchesne), i, 396–7, 401, 410, 417, 418, 419, 432; and for imperial donations, LP (Mommsen), 165, 186–7; LP (Duchesne), i, 417 (the last one listed was from the exarch).

⁷⁵ D. James, *God and Gold in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge and New York, 1998).

⁷⁶ B. Brenk, *Die frühchristlichen Mosaiken in S. Maria Maggiore zu Rom* (Wiesbaden, 1975); S. Spain, "'The Promised Blessing': The Iconography of the Mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore," *The Art Bulletin*, 61 (1979), 518–40.

⁷⁷ A. Weis, "Ein Petruszyklus des 7. Jahrhunderts im Querschiff der Vatikanischen Basilika," *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte*, 58 (1963), 230–70.

⁷⁸ *Basilica di San Pietro*, 50–52, 54.

⁷⁹ C. Ihm, *Die Programme der christlichen Apsismalerei: vom 4. Jahrhundert bis zur Mitte des 8. Jahrhunderts*, 2nd edn (Stuttgart, 1992), 114–19, 141–2, plate 26, no. 1.

⁸⁰ See the volumes of the series *La pittura medievale a Roma, 312–1431*, ed. M. Andaloro and S. Romano (Milan, 2006–).

⁸¹ P.J. Nordhagen, *The Frescoes of John VII (A.D. 705–707) in S. Maria Antiqua in Rome* (Rome, 1968); and now *Santa Maria Antiqua al Foro Romano*.

Marian icons are known from Rome in this period, as well as an icon of Jesus as Savior said to be *acheiropoietā* (not made by human hands) now stored in the Sancta Sanctorum.⁸²

At least in some cases, the artwork of Rome's churches may have interacted with aspects of the liturgy. In some cases, the pope may have sponsored depictions of Jesus in the apses of Roman churches that would have created an association through the liturgy between the heavenly Lord above and the clerical lords sitting directly beneath the images.⁸³ When saints' passions were read in Santa Maria Antiqua in the context of Mass, the dramatic paintings of the saints may have helped to bring their stories to life and promote their veneration.⁸⁴

The moveable wealth of the Church would have been on display in the course of liturgy. The precious items necessary to stage a papal Mass were considerable: various vessels, a chalice, strainers, a paten, a liturgical straw, thuribles, candlesticks, and books. These no longer exist from the city of Rome in this period, but there are comparable extant items. The sixth- and seventh-century silver treasures excavated in the early-twentieth century in northern Syria contain several items intended for liturgical use like chalices, patens, and strainers.⁸⁵ Also extant are eighth- and ninth-century Carolingian chalices.⁸⁶ These surviving examples hint at the fine workmanship, rich ornamentation, and intricate designs that were often incorporated into these pieces. In addition to being a visual pleasure, the thurible released sweet-smelling incense during the Mass.⁸⁷ Incense was a frequent presence at the liturgy and was believed by many to allow humans to approach God through scent.⁸⁸

⁸² The Marian icons are now at Santa Maria Nuova, Santa Maria dei Martiri (the Pantheon), and Santa Maria in Trastevere. M. Andaloro, "Le icone a Roma in età preiconoclasta," in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente*, i, 719–53; G. Wolf, *Salus populi Romani: Die Geschichte römischer Kultbilder im Mittelalter* (Weinheim, 1990). More generally on icons and their role in the liturgy, see H. Belting, *Bild und Kult: Eine Geschichte des Bildes vor dem Zeitalter der Kunst* (Munich, 1990).

⁸³ T.F. Mathews, *The Clash of Gods*, revised edn (Princeton, NJ, 1993), 92–114. The specific example Mathews handles is the apse mosaic in the Roman church Santa Pudenziana.

⁸⁴ L. Jessop, "Pictorial Cycles of Non-Biblical Saints: The Seventh- and Eighth-Century Mural Cycles in Rome and Contexts for their Use," *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 67 (1999), 233–79.

⁸⁵ M.M. Mango, *Silver from Early Byzantium: The Kaper Koraon and Related Treasures* (Baltimore, MD, 1986). The items were separated into the Stuma, Riha, Hama, and Antioch collections.

⁸⁶ V.H. Elbern, "Kelche der Karolingerzeit," in *Irish Antiquities: Essays in Memory of Joseph Rafferty*, ed. M. Ryan (Bray, Co. Wicklow, 1998), 123–40.

⁸⁷ LP (Mommsen), 213–14.

⁸⁸ S.A. Harvey, *Scenting Salvation: Ancient Christianity and the Olfactory Imagination* (Berkeley, 2006), 75–83.

The need to keep track of such items in the course of this liturgy was likely one of the reasons that OR I makes ample reference to them. I think that it served in part as a managerial handbook to regulate and protect liturgical furnishings. An analysis of OR I reveals how significant precious things were for its composer. In OR I:22, one learns that the chalice, large patens, and large evangelaries can only leave the Lateran with the seal of the *vesterarius*, who checks the number of gems on them so none of them would be “lost” or, more likely, stolen. The breaking of the seal was only done under the order of the pope’s right-hand man, the archdeacon, in OR I:30. OR I:20 is careful to define who is responsible for the books that the subdeacon and archdeacon have under their care (“*sub cura sua*”). OR I:65 carefully delineates when the acolytes and the subdeacon would return the evangelary to the Lateran, another sign of its high value. As soon as it was no longer required for the ceremony, it was returned to where it was kept, no doubt to prevent theft.⁸⁹ OR I:30 lays out the contingency plan in case a larger evangelary would be necessary, and the difference in how the ritual would play out in that circumstance. This fear of robbery of sacred items was not paranoia on the part of the pope and his ministers: the *Liber pontificalis* reports that in the beginning of the reign of Pope Severinus in 640, the army plundered the Lateran.⁹⁰

The importance of precious items in the papal Mass is revealed in what seems an unconscious trend. In four chapters of OR I, the items that are carried replace ministers as subjects of the sentences: *cereostata* (not the acolytes carrying them) are the subject of OR I:46, 49, and 125; in OR I:103 *patena* is the subject of a sentence. The *stationarius* is charged to ensure that other acolytes carried items in procession.⁹¹ In OR I:105 the archdeacon is described as heading towards the paten (“*ad patenam*”), not to a place. It is possible that parts of OR I:19–21 were derived from an inventory of precious items used at the Mass, perhaps contributed by the guardian of treasure, vessels, and precious furnishings known as the *vesterarius*.⁹²

The vestments of the clergy were just as elaborate as the precious items used in the Mass. These were a tangible sign of the clergy’s connection with the Roman past, since the clergy of Rome borrowed the style of its vestments from late

⁸⁹ For an idea of how ornate seventh-century evangelaries in Rome were, see the depiction of a liturgical book on the apse mosaic of Sant’Agnese fuori le Mura. Ihm, *Programme*, 114–19, 142–3, plate 26, no. 1. The chalice was returned to the Lateran after it was no longer needed: see OR I:112.

⁹⁰ LP (Mommsen), 175.

⁹¹ OR I:11.

⁹² For different papal departments contributing to the *Liber pontificalis*, see H. Geertman, “La genesi del *Liber pontificalis* romano: Un processo di organizzazione della memoria,” in *Liber, gesta, histoire: écrire l’histoire des évêques et des papes, de l’antiquité au XXI^e siècle*, ed. F. Bougard and M. Sot (Turnhout, 2009), 37–107.

imperial magistrates.⁹³ Although the custom had begun earlier, OR I is the first extant source that shows the clergy's putting special liturgical vestments over their everyday clothing⁹⁴ or gives us an idea of the state of liturgical vestments in the seventh or eighth centuries.⁹⁵

No member of the clergy was more burdened with vestments than the pope. Before Mass, the pope was vested by the other clergy. The pope wore three undergarments. First came the alb (*linea*),⁹⁶ a long, white linen vestment with narrow sleeves that was close in form to the classical tunic.⁹⁷ The belt for the alb was the *cingulum*, made of linen or hemp.⁹⁸ The amice, an oblong or square linen cloth was placed over the neck and shoulders.⁹⁹ The pope wore four outer garments. He had two dalmatics, a white robe made of linen or wool sometimes ornamented with stripes with very wide sleeves that extended down to the feet.¹⁰⁰ The woolen and shorter one was worn underneath the other, larger one.¹⁰¹ A chasuble, a wide square or circular garment like a poncho with a hole for the head but without any sleeves,¹⁰² was put on top of both of them. It was made of wool, canvas, or cotton, and was colored. The final vestment was the pallium, a white woolen scarf with four black silk crosses.¹⁰³ It was draped on the breast, neck, and shoulders. The pallium symbolized his role as a shepherd and was the preserve of the pope and those to whom he granted it, and then only for use in the liturgy on certain days. It was laid over the chasuble and held in place with a lead pin.¹⁰⁴ The pin was most likely intended to hold the pallium as depicted in Sant'Agnese fuori le Mura: with one side hanging down low, and the other side attached midway so it draped in a u-shape on the pope's chest.¹⁰⁵ The pope could decide which of the deacons or reginary subdeacons merited the special honor

⁹³ T. Klauser, "Der Ursprung der bischöflichen Insignien und Ehrenrechte," *Bonner Akademische Reden*, 1 (1948), 5–44.

⁹⁴ J. Braun, *Die liturgische Gewandung im Occident und Orient nach Ursprung und Entwicklung, Verwendung und Symbolik* (Freiburg im Breisgau and St. Louis, 1907), 772–3.

⁹⁵ Braun, *Liturgische Gewandung*, 777.

⁹⁶ Angenendt, *Frühmittelalter*, 247; S. Beissel, *Bilder aus der Geschichte der altchristlichen Kunst und Liturgie in Italien* (Freiburg im Breisgau and St. Louis, 1899), 303.

⁹⁷ Braun, *Liturgische Gewandung*, 57–101.

⁹⁸ Braun, *Liturgische Gewandung*, 101–17.

⁹⁹ Braun, *Liturgische Gewandung*, 21–52 (esp. at 23); and Klauser, *Short*, 61. OR I contains the first extant reference to an amice.

¹⁰⁰ Braun, *Liturgische Gewandung*, 247–305.

¹⁰¹ Klauser, *Short*, 61.

¹⁰² Braun, *Liturgische Gewandung*, 149–247.

¹⁰³ Braun, *Liturgische Gewandung*, 620–74.

¹⁰⁴ Klauser, *Short*, 61. OR I is the first reference to a pin being used to hold the pallium in place: Braun, *Liturgische Gewandung*, 644–5.

¹⁰⁵ Ihm, *Programme*, 114–19, 142–3, plate 26, no. 1.

of attaching the pallium with the pin; afterwards, the person chosen requested a blessing from the pope, which the pope granted.¹⁰⁶ Finally, the pope carried a maniple or ceremonial napkin (*mappula*)¹⁰⁷ similar to the official handkerchief used by emperors to open games.¹⁰⁸ He briefly surrendered it to the regionary subdeacon as a sign that he had the pope's authority to learn the names of the cantor and lector before the beginning of Mass.¹⁰⁹ The combined effect of these vestments must have meant that the pope was physically weighed down.¹¹⁰

The first reference to headwear comes during the reign of Pope Constantine (708–715), when the *Liber pontificalis* describes how, when in Constantinople, he wore a papal camel-hair cap just as he did during processions in Rome.¹¹¹ During the Mass, the pope's head would be uncovered.¹¹² Though OR I does not mention them specifically, the pope like other bishops wore special liturgical sandals and stockings.¹¹³ The sandals were known as *campagi*. They were a form of low shoe made of black leather, covering only the tip of the foot and the heel, and attached to the foot with straps. In Rome, wearing a cross on the sandals was a privilege reserved for the pope. The linen liturgical stockings were called *udones*.¹¹⁴

OR I gives us some hints as to how the other members of the clergy were vested for liturgical celebrations.¹¹⁵ Wearing the appropriate vestments was a serious business for the pope's ministers: one *primicerius* of the notaries had to ask for a special pardon from the pope after having arrived for a procession without his chasuble.¹¹⁶ Four additional members of the clergy wore a chasuble, because they carried sacred items over it:¹¹⁷ the *primicerius* of the notaries,¹¹⁸ the

¹⁰⁶ OR I:36.

¹⁰⁷ Baldovin, *Urban Character*, 132; Klauser, *Short*, 61.

¹⁰⁸ Alföldi, *Die monarchische Repräsentation*, 152–4, 175.

¹⁰⁹ OR I:37–8.

¹¹⁰ Baldovin, *Urban Character*, 132 n. 6.

¹¹¹ LP (Mommson), 224: "... apostolicus pontifex cum camelaucio in civitate, ut solitus est Roma procedere."

¹¹² Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Legum Sectio III, Concilia aevi Karolini, ed. A. Werminghoff (Hanover, 1906–1908), i, 8–32, at 18; Ihm, *Programme*, 114–19, 142–3, plate 26, no. 1.

¹¹³ Braun, *Liturgische Gewandung*, 384–424.

¹¹⁴ Ihm, *Programme*, 114–19, 142–3, plate 26, no. 1.

¹¹⁵ LP (Duchesne), ii, 4. As Duchesne notes (LP (Duchesne), ii, 36 n. 19), the implication of this story is that the clergy dressed differently in liturgical celebrations than for their court functions.

¹¹⁶ LP (Duchesne), ii, 4.

¹¹⁷ Cf. the image of the pope in Sant'Agnese fuori le Mura carrying a basilica with his chasuble. Ihm, *Programme*, 114–19, 142–3, plate 26, no 1.

¹¹⁸ OR I:114.

regional subdeacons,¹¹⁹ the acolytes,¹²⁰ and the attendant subdeacons.¹²¹ The deacons were not allowed to wear chasubles during the Mass, only dalmatics.¹²² It is not until the end of the eighth and beginning of the ninth centuries that any reference exists to the deacons' *stola*, a special sash that went over their left shoulder and across their chest,¹²³ but it is unclear when they started wearing them. The acolyte who carried the paten sometimes tied the *sin don* around his neck as a modified vestment.¹²⁴ The *sin don* was used to carry the offerings of the faithful, but would also help the acolyte handle the paten.¹²⁵ It was presumably used because of this cloth's association with the Eucharist. During the Mass, all of the clergy had bare heads.¹²⁶

The Music of the Mass

The visual aspects of the liturgy did not exist in an auditory vacuum. The Mass was a feast not only for the eyes but for the ears. The most striking evidence of this fact comes in the extensive and even overwhelming musical program performed at Masses.¹²⁷ Music was recurrent in the papal Mass and accompanied some of its most important action. OR I is laconic about the exact performance of the musical parts of Mass, though in many cases it is the first evidence of some

¹¹⁹ OR I:37, 64, 70. It seems that subdeacons were no longer required to only wear the alb, as they did in the time of Gregory I: Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 586–7, and for interpretation of this passage, Beissel, *Bilder*, 306.

¹²⁰ OR I:30, 31. In OR I:19, it is listed right before the sacks used to carry the Eucharist, which suggests its connection with Communion.

¹²¹ OR I:32, 92.

¹²² OR I:47. A custom said to have started with Pope Sylvester (314–335): LP (Geertman), 173.

¹²³ Braun, *Liturgische Gewandung*, 575.

¹²⁴ OR I:91. I cannot see the use of the *sin don* having anything to do with the weight of the paten, as *Eglise en prière*, 293 would have it. From the description in OR I, it seems that the cloth was wrapped around his neck, but the cloth was not attached to the paten. Instead, he seems to support the paten against his chest.

¹²⁵ OR I:71–2.

¹²⁶ Batiffol, *Leçons*, 72. See the clergy in the apse mosaic in the Oratory of San Venanzio in the Lateran complex in *San Giovanni in Laterano*, 56–9.

¹²⁷ For the plainchant of the papal Mass, see W. Apel, *Gregorian Chant* (Bloomington, IN, 1958), 23–8; R.L. Crocker, *An Introduction to Gregorian Chant* (New Haven, CT, 2000), 111–27; D. Hiley, *Western Plainchant: A Handbook* (Oxford and New York, 1993), 109–68; and *idem*, *Gregorian Chant* (Cambridge, 2009), 23–5, 58–71, 73–82, 86–8; P. Wagner, *Einführung in die gregorianischen Melodien: Ein Handbuch der Choralwissenschaft*, 3 vols (Hildesheim, 1962), i, 58–131.

of the proper musical parts.¹²⁸ Reconstructing the music of this period in detail or transcribing it into modern musical notation is difficult given that chant in this period was still an oral tradition, passed down from teacher to student.¹²⁹ It is unclear when and where people started to write down neumes, the musical notations of Gregorian chant, but it was most likely in the third quarter of the eighth century in Francia.¹³⁰ The music for chant is only recorded in Frankish graduals written down after c.900.¹³¹ These staffless neumes indicate the direction of the melody, but not the size of the intervals between notes. Because of this gap in the evidence, there is no way to test how similar the performance of chants would have been in Rome to what can be found later north of the Alps. Better preserved, however, are the words that were sung and are in the antiphoner. By this point, some chants had been in use in the Roman Church for centuries. Most of the proper or changeable chants were derived from the Psalms, though some are from other books of the Bible. These were at times altered from the original wording, and in some cases Old Latin versions of Scripture were the source.¹³²

The Mass contained several different chants, which were keyed to certain parts of the ceremony. Several of the chants were sung early in the ceremony. The entrance antiphon or introit accompanied the procession of the clergy to the altar.¹³³ The *Gloria patri* or “little doxology” expressed glory to the persons of the Trinity after the Psalm verses of the introit and the Communion antiphon.¹³⁴ After the first appearance of the *Gloria patri*, the chant *Kyrie eleison*, requesting God’s mercy, started.¹³⁵ This chant was initially employed in penitential

¹²⁸ McKinnon, *Advent Project*, 195 (introit), 249 (Alleluia), 300–301 (offertory antiphon), 327 (Communion antiphon).

¹²⁹ L. Treitler, “Homer and Gregory: The Transmission of Epic Poetry and Plainchant,” *The Musical Quarterly*, 60 (1974), 333–72.

¹³⁰ K. Levy, “Gregorian Chant and Oral Transmission,” in *Essays on Medieval Music in Honor of David G. Hughes*, ed. G.M. Boone, Isham Library Papers, 4 (Cambridge, MA, 1995), 277–86, at 285.

¹³¹ J. McKinnon, “The Emergence of Gregorian Chant in the Carolingian Era,” in *Antiquity and the Middle Ages: From Ancient Greece to the 15th Century*, ed. J. McKinnon (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1990), 88–111, at 94. No notation would appear in Rome until after the mid-eleventh century.

¹³² C. Tietze, *Hymn Introits for the Liturgical Year: The Origin and Early Development of the Latin Texts* (Chicago, 2005), 59–81.

¹³³ P.M. Guy, “The Meaning and the Function of the Introit,” in *Liturgy and the Arts in the Middle Ages: Studies in Honour of C. Clifford Flanigan*, ed. E.L. Lillie and N.H. Petersen (Copenhagen, 1996), 64–74.

¹³⁴ OR I:50, 117, 122.

¹³⁵ OR I:52. On the content of the Kyrie, see E. Bishop, “Liturgical Comments and Memoranda,” *Journal of Theological Studies*, 12 (1911), 384–413, at 408–413; C. Callewaert, “Les étapes de l’histoire du Kyrie,” *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique*, 38 (1942), 20–45; P. de

processions, and only later incorporated into the structure of the Mass.¹³⁶ The composer of OR I referred to the *Kyrie eleison* as a litany (*laetania*) in OR I:52.¹³⁷ Sources as late as the sixth century refer to the *Kyrie* as an independent chant that could sometimes be joined with a litany,¹³⁸ but by the late-seventh century this distinction no longer seems to have held. Litanies became associated with popular processions sponsored by the papacy, some of which were penitential.¹³⁹ After the *Kyrie* came the *Gloria in excelsis Deo*, the “great doxology” intended to glorify God by its words.¹⁴⁰ The performance of this Gloria at this time was done only in the presence of the bishop, save on Easter day; it could only be performed on Sundays or feast days.¹⁴¹ Since it was a chant of rejoicing, it was omitted on Holy Innocents because of the mourning associated with this feast.¹⁴²

Several of the chants came later in the Mass. Two of them were interspersed with the readings of the Mass. The gradual was performed after the first reading, followed by the *Alleluia*, and then the Gospel.¹⁴³ The offertory accompanied the ritual donation of bread and wine.¹⁴⁴ The *Sanctus* or angelic hymn, which is another chant in praise of God, was delivered before the Canon.¹⁴⁵ The *Agnus Dei* was performed during the breaking of the consecrated bread and before its distribution.¹⁴⁶ While the Communion was distributed, the choir performed the Communion antiphon.¹⁴⁷ There was no music for the recession in this era.

Clerck, *La prière universelle dans les liturgies latines anciennes: témoignages patristiques et textes liturgiques* (Münster, 1977), 282–95.

¹³⁶ J.F. Baldovin, “Kyrie Eleison and the Entrance Rite of the Roman Eucharist,” *Worship*, 60 (1986), 334–47.

¹³⁷ A. Fortescue, *The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy* (London and New York, 1950), 237 n. 1. Although it is unclear from OR I itself whether the litany is the *Kyrie eleison* itself or a separate litany attached to the *Kyrie*, this becomes clear by comparison with the near-contemporary OR XI:90 (“laetania cantantes, hoc est *Kyrieleison*...”), in *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 444; and *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 85, in which the context shows that the *Kyrie* is considered a litany.

¹³⁸ Clerck, *Prière universelle*, 282–95.

¹³⁹ Gregory of Tours, *Gregorii Turonensis Opera*, i: *Libri historiarum* X, ed. B. Krusch and W. Levison, *Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* (Hanover, 1937), 479–81; LP (Mommson), 155, 172, 192, 215.

¹⁴⁰ Crocker, *Introduction*, 111, 116, 122.

¹⁴¹ OR II:9 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 115); *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 85; LP (Geertman), 226.

¹⁴² *Antiphonale*, 20–21.

¹⁴³ Both appear in OR I:57.

¹⁴⁴ OR I:87; J. Dyer, “The Offertory Chant of the Roman Liturgy and its Musical Form,” *Studi musicali*, 11 (1982), 3–30.

¹⁴⁵ OR I:87.

¹⁴⁶ OR I:99, 105; LP (Mommson), 215; Jungmann, *MS*, ii, 414–15.

¹⁴⁷ OR I:117.

Three chants of the Mass were designated as antiphonal: the entrance antiphon or introit; the offertory antiphon; and the Communion antiphon.¹⁴⁸ These chants consisted of two main parts: the antiphon and the Psalm. The antiphon is a short line of music, the words of which are taken from the Bible. Generally, the source is from the Book of Psalms, and very often a part of the same Psalm was sung in the verses. There are times when the antiphon was a mixture of more than one Psalm, or that Psalm texts were not used at all. The other component of these chants is verses derived from a Psalm. In comparison to later medieval practice, OR I seems to envision using an entire Psalm. It is a matter of some controversy as to what the term “antiphon” refers and how the antiphon was sung in relationship to the verses of the Psalm.¹⁴⁹ The most likely reconstruction is that the antiphon was sung at the beginning, then the Psalm, and then at the end the antiphon was repeated – rather than interpolating the antiphon between Psalm verses.¹⁵⁰ The Psalm verses themselves were sung in antiphonal alternation, that is trading off between the two semi-choirs.¹⁵¹ The reason that the pope must stop the performance of the choir is that they could potentially chant as long as necessary to accomplish the liturgical actions.¹⁵² Even if they had a somewhat shorter Psalm, the choir could return to the first verse and start again.

The remaining chants were performed differently. The cantor was responsible for the gradual (from the *gradus*, step, where he delivered it).¹⁵³ The mode of delivery seems to have been that the cantor sang the respond (or refrain), then the choir repeated it; then the cantor sang the first verse, then the choir gave the

¹⁴⁸ For discussion of antiphons, see Apel, *Gregorian Chant*, 185–96; Crocker, *Introduction*, 106–109; Hiley, *Western Plainchant*, 88–99.

¹⁴⁹ H. Hucke, “Zu einigen Problemen der Choralforschung,” *Die Musikforschung*, 11 (1958), 385–414, at 386; E. Nowacki, “The Gregorian Office Antiphons and the Comparative Method,” *The Journal of Musicology*, 4 (1985–1986), 243–75.

¹⁵⁰ E. Nowacki, “The Latin Antiphon and the Question of Frequency of Interpolation,” *Plainsong and Medieval Music*, 21 (2012), 23–39. Nowacki argued (at 28 n. 20) that the repeated verse (OR I:50, 117) was in fact a reference to the antiphon.

¹⁵¹ That the singers were separated into two half-choirs is clear from OR I:43. For this understanding of antiphons, see Apel, *Gregorian Chant*, 185–6; Crocker, *Introduction*, 106–109, 118; Wagner, *Einführung*, i, 65–6. This understanding of antiphonal singing corresponds to Isidore’s description: *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, ed. C.M. Lawson (Turnhout, 1989), 7–8; and *idem, Etymologiae*, ed. W.M. Lindsay, 2 vols (Oxford, 1911), i, 246.

¹⁵² OR I:85.

¹⁵³ R.J. Hesbert, “Le gaudel, chant responsorial,” *Ephemerides liturgicae*, 95 (1981), 316–50; M. Huglo, “Le répons-graduel de la messe: Evolution de la forme, permanence de la fonction,” in *Schweizer Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft*, N.S. 2 (1982), 53–73; and reprinted in his *Chant grégorien et musique médiévale* (Aldershot, 2005), no. III. This chant would later be referred to as the responsorial Psalm.

respond; then the cantor sang the second verse, then the choir gave the respond; and so on through the verses of the Psalm. The *Alleluia* was performed similarly. The cantor first sang the *Alleluia*, and then the choir responded to it; the cantor sang the verse of the *Alleluia*; and then the choir sang a final *Alleluia* together.¹⁵⁴ The *Alleluia* was in Rome as late as the beginning of the fifth century reserved for the Easter season, but by the sixth century, its use had extended throughout the ecclesiastical year with a few exceptions.¹⁵⁵ The tract, which is first attested in OR I,¹⁵⁶ was a chant sung during penitential seasons. It had neither a verse nor a refrain, but instead was a series of Psalm verses.¹⁵⁷ It substituted for the *Alleluia* on certain days of the year known for their solemnity, mourning, or penitence.¹⁵⁸ The *Kyrie eleison* was likely sung with a number of petitions interspersed between repetitions of “Kyrie eleison” and “Christe eleison.”¹⁵⁹ It appears that the *Gloria patri*, along with *Gloria in excelsis Deo*, *Sanctus*, and *Agnus Dei*, were sung by the choir in unison, although it is impossible to exclude that they would sometimes alternate verses of them. There is little evidence one way or the other, though alternating would diminish the force of the *schola*’s performance in the huge basilicas of Rome.

All the music in the Mass was performed as chants without the accompaniment of any instrument.¹⁶⁰ The use of instrumentation in Masses in this period carried negative connotations, based on the condemnations of the Fathers of the Church.¹⁶¹ Although the introduction of the organ into Western liturgy remains obscure, the idea that it had anything to do with Pope Vitalian (657–672) is a myth.¹⁶² It is possible, though not certain, that the faithful

¹⁵⁴ For the *Alleluia*, see A.-G. Martimort, “Origine et signification de l’alléluia de la messe romaine,” in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, ed. P. Granfield and J.A. Jungmann, 2 vols (Münster/Westfalen, 1970), ii, 811–834; McKinnon, *Advent Project*, 249 (though McKinnon thinks “Alleluia” was only chanted once at the beginning).

¹⁵⁵ J. Froger, “L’Alleluja dans l’usage romain,” *Ephemerides liturgicae*, 62 (1948), 6–48.

¹⁵⁶ McKinnon, *Advent Project*, 280.

¹⁵⁷ McKinnon, *Advent Project*, 93.

¹⁵⁸ Wagner, *Einführung*, i, 98.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. other litanies in the antiphoner: *Antiphonale*, 48–9, 112–13, 202–203.

¹⁶⁰ J. Froger, *Les chants de la messe aux VIII^e et IX^e siècles* (Paris, 1950), 52.

¹⁶¹ For patristic attitudes towards music, see *Music in Early Christian Literature*, ed. J. McKinnon (Cambridge, 1987).

¹⁶² P.F. Williams, *The Organ in Western Culture, 750–1250* (Cambridge and New York, 1993), 7–12. The organ still might have been associated with large-scale pagan festivals in amphitheatres and circuses, and even potentially with the Christians martyred in them. See D. Schubert, *Kaiserliche Liturgie: Die Einbeziehung von Musikinstrumenten, insbesondere der Orgel, in den frühmittelalterlichen Gottesdienst* (Göttingen, 1968).

appreciated the variation in the methods of chanting, rather than the pairing of voices and instruments.¹⁶³

The primary singers were the pope's professional *schola cantorum*, a group that counted at least one pope as an alumnus.¹⁶⁴ This group included boys, some of whom would advance in the clergy; its adult members were subdeacons. In the late-seventh century, many popes were particularly interested in liturgical music and shaped the musical performance of the Mass.¹⁶⁵ James McKinnon argued that these papacies, and the late-seventh century in general, represent a period of feverish activity in the composition of Mass propers centered around the *schola cantorum*.¹⁶⁶ This thesis has proved controversial, and other scholars have doubted whether there was such a level of planning behind the development of the antiphons.¹⁶⁷ Whatever their part in composing the music, the *schola* was the main body responsible for chanting.

The rationale behind choosing the texts to be chanted generally remains obscure, though not in all cases. The music sung on important feasts, like Christmas or Easter, was thematically related to the day. The introit for the Christmas Mass during the day, *Puer natus est*, adapted from Isaiah 9:6, is meant to refer to Jesus; whereas the gradual *Haec dies*, taken from Psalm 117:24, was thought to refer to Easter and so was used between Sunday and Thursday of Easter Week.¹⁶⁸ Some of the chant texts for the celebration of the feast of the protomartyr Stephen were paraphrased from the account of his death in the New Testament.¹⁶⁹ Musical pieces may also have been influenced by the station church chosen for a particular celebration: for instance, chanting antiphons that include a reference to Jerusalem when the station church was Santa Croce in

¹⁶³ Froger, *Chants*, 53–4.

¹⁶⁴ J. Dyer, "The Schola Cantorum and its Roman Milieu in the Early Middle Ages," in *De Musica et Cantu: Studien zur Geschichte der Kirchenmusik und der Oper: Helmut Huckle zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. P. Cahn and A.K. Heimer (Hildesheim and New York, 1993), 19–40. Sergius I had been a member of the *schola*: LP (Mommsen), 210.

¹⁶⁵ For the popes' control over the musical part of the Mass, see OR I:52, 85, 117. For popes experienced in chanting, see Sergius I: LP (Mommsen), 210 ("capax in officio cantelenae"); Leo II: LP (Mommsen), 200; Benedict II: LP (Mommsen), 203. Pope Vitalian may also have had a hand in the development of music and the *schola* in Rome, since centuries later, the members of the *schola cantorum* were known as *Vitaliani*. S.J.P. Van Dijk, "The Urban and Papal Rites in the VII and VIII Century in Rome," *Sacris erudiri*, 12 (1961), 411–87, at 465–6.

¹⁶⁶ McKinnon, *Advent Project*.

¹⁶⁷ See reviews by J. Dyer in *Early Music History*, 20 (2001), 279–309; P. Jeffery in *American Musicological Society*, 56 (2003), 169–79; S. Rankin in *Plain-song and Medieval Music*, 11 (2002), 73–98.

¹⁶⁸ *Antiphonale*, 14–15, 100–105.

¹⁶⁹ *Antiphonale*, 16–17. The Alleluia and Communion antiphon borrow from Acts 7:55.

Gerusalemme.¹⁷⁰ As I have argued elsewhere, the introit for the third Sunday in Advent from Philippians 4:4–6 was in all likelihood introduced as a piece of propaganda for the consecration of Sergius I (687–701) as pope.¹⁷¹

Prayers, Readings, and Sermon

The Roman Mass also contained a considerable number of prayers. The first major prayer was the collect, said at the end of the opening part of the Mass and before the readings.¹⁷² The prayer over the offerings (*oratio super oblata*) blessed the bread and wine offered by the laity and clergy.¹⁷³ The most sacred series of prayers were combined in the Canon, a Greek term meaning “rule” or “standard.”¹⁷⁴ The technical liturgical term for the Roman Canon of the Mass, like the prayers of consecration of the Eucharist in other traditions, is an anaphora. During the Canon, it was believed that the bread and wine would be transformed into the body and blood of Jesus. The determinant factor in the transformation of the bread and wine was the prayers delivered. Anecdotes from the *Spiritual Meadow* demonstrate how ordinary bread could be turned into the Eucharist by the pronouncement of the words of the Canon, whether or not the person saying them was a priest.¹⁷⁵ All of these prayers were said out loud.¹⁷⁶ Consecration was not thought to happen at one precise moment, a view

¹⁷⁰ *Antiphonale*, 4–5 (Communion antiphon), 74–5 (introit); H. Grisar, *Das Missale im Lichte römischer Stadtgeschichte: Stationen, Perikopen, Gebräuche* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1925), 46–7; Willis, *Further Essays*, 83.

¹⁷¹ *Antiphonale*, 6–7; J.F. Romano, “Joy in Waiting? The History of Gaudete Sunday,” *Mediaeval Studies*, 72 (2010), 75–124, at 81–90.

¹⁷² OR I:53. B. Capelle, “Collecta,” *Revue bénédictine*, 42 (1930), 197–204. I use this term “collect” because it is conventional, but in OR I it is simply referred to as the first prayer (*oratio prima*).

¹⁷³ Omitted from OR I, but in *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 86. This prayer would later be whispered and referred to as the *secreta* (secret). Klauser, *Short*, 66.

¹⁷⁴ OR I:88–90. For the Canon, see *Prex eucharistica, Volumen III, Studia*, ed. A. Gerhards, H. Brakmann, and M. Klöckener (Fribourg, 2005), esp. contributions by B. Spinks, “The Roman Canon Missae” (129–43) and J. Schmitz, “Canon Romanus” (281–310). The centerpiece of these prayers would in time be seen as the Institution Narrative, which is when the priest imitates Jesus’ words at the Last Supper. *L’ordinaire*, 80.

¹⁷⁵ John Moschos, *Spiritual Meadow*, PG, lxxxvii, 2869D, 2872A; PG, lxxxvii, 3080D–3081A–D–3084A. See also Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 1066–9. The faithful at Bishop Januarius’ Masses were unsure whether or not his Communion was valid because the bishop had trouble getting through the words of the Canon.

¹⁷⁶ Jungmann, *MS*, ii, 173–4. See also John Moschos, *Spiritual Meadow*, PG, lxxxvii, 2869D, 2872A; 3013D, 3016A–C; 3080D–3081A–D, 3084A.

stemming from twelfth-century Scholasticism, but was a longer process.¹⁷⁷ There was no high elevation of the bread after the consecration or genuflection after that in this period.¹⁷⁸ Two prayers immediately followed the Canon. The first of these was the *Pater noster*, the Lord's Prayer;¹⁷⁹ this was followed by the *Libera nos*, which asks God to deliver people from evils.¹⁸⁰

The two subsequent prayers, the *Pax domini* and *Fiat commixtio*, were accompanied by more complicated liturgical action.¹⁸¹ The *Pax domini* introduced the Kiss of Peace but was also the first of two times that the pope put a piece of consecrated bread into the chalice. There was a difference between the two pieces of bread he inserted. The first piece of bread was a part of the consecrated bread (*de Sancta*) that he consecrated at the previous papal Mass, a custom peculiar to the Roman Mass.¹⁸² The second piece was from the bread that he consecrated at the current Mass. This process is known as the *commixtio* (mixing), that is of the body and blood of Jesus.¹⁸³ When the breaking of consecrated bread was completed, the pope received the consecrated bread and wine at his seat. After taking a bite out of the bread, he placed the rest of it inside the chalice. This was the second *commixtio*, and during it, the pope pronounced the prayer *Fiat commixtio*, which was intended to ensure eternal life for those receiving the Eucharist.¹⁸⁴ Having two *commixtiones* was a unique feature of the celebration of the Roman Mass.¹⁸⁵ The final prayer (*oratio ad complendum*) was said after the reception of Communion and before the recession out of the church.¹⁸⁶

Prayer was seen to be a clerical affair and, in particular, the prayers would have been dominated by the main celebrant, the pope or another priest substituting for him. This included the *Pater noster* in Rome, though this was not the rule

¹⁷⁷ J.F. Baldovin, "The Empire Baptized," in *The Oxford History of Christian Worship*, ed. G. Wainwright and K.B. Westerfield Tucker (New York, 2006), 77–130, at 99.

¹⁷⁸ Klauser, *Short*, 66.

¹⁷⁹ Omitted in OR I, but in *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 91.

¹⁸⁰ OR I:94.

¹⁸¹ *Pax domini* in OR I:95; and *Fiat commixtio* in OR I:107.

¹⁸² Angenendt, *Frühmittelalter*, 248; Klauser, *Short*, 62.

¹⁸³ For the *commixtio*, see J.P. de Jong, "L'arrière-plan dogmatique du rite de la commixtion dans la messe romaine," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 3 (1953), 78–97; *idem*, "Le rite de la commixtion dans la messe romaine, dans ses rapports avec les liturgies syriennes," in *ibid.*, 4 (1956), 245–78 and 5 (1957), 33–77.

¹⁸⁴ OR I:107. This prayer does not appear in the Gregorian Sacramentary, which may mean it was a recent addition to the Roman Mass.

¹⁸⁵ Amalar of Metz, *Amalarii episcopi opera liturgica omnia*, ed. J.M. Hanssens, *Studi e testi*, 138–40 (Vatican City, 1948–1950), ii, 363.

¹⁸⁶ OR I:123. It can also be referred to as a *postcommunio*, a postcommunion prayer.

everywhere in the contemporary world.¹⁸⁷ The laity might not necessarily have understood all of the nuances of the prayers, especially those with a complicated periodic structure, though the majority of Romans at this time were native Latin speakers and would likely have comprehended the main message.¹⁸⁸ Prayers, like readings, were said in a simple form of chant sometimes referred to as the liturgical recitative, which used a single melody and stressed the clear delivery of the content.¹⁸⁹

The Bible was an integral source for liturgical symbolism and likely would have informed the understanding of worship of the clergy versed in patristic authors.¹⁹⁰ But the main, and most direct, experience that most people had with Scripture was during the readings at Mass.¹⁹¹ In the Roman Mass there is no proof that there were ever more than two readings.¹⁹² The book in which the first readings were contained was the *apostulum* or epistolary,¹⁹³ although this is something of a misnomer. It contained several readings from the Old Testament and the Acts of the Apostles, in addition to the readings from the New Testament epistles, from which it got its name.¹⁹⁴ There was also the evangelary in which the Gospel readings or second reading was contained, the cover of which was bejeweled and featured gold.¹⁹⁵ As native speakers of Latin, Romans would have understood the public proclamation of the readings.¹⁹⁶ The Church had abandoned the ancient custom of a continuous reading (*lectio continua*) of the Scriptures at Mass in favor of choosing short selections from Biblical books called pericopes, although some vestiges of the older system remained.¹⁹⁷ In the Roman Mass, only a miniscule portion of the Old Testament would ever be read,

¹⁸⁷ Gregory I, *Registrum*, i, 586–7. Gregory says that the priest (in the singular) is the only one who says the prayer, which I take to mean the celebrant of the Mass.

¹⁸⁸ Generally on this topic, see F. Brittain, *Latin in Church* (Cambridge, 1934).

¹⁸⁹ Apel, *Gregorian Chant*, 201–45; Crocker, *Introduction*, 5; Hiley, *Western Plainchant*, 47–58.

¹⁹⁰ J. Daniélou, *The Bible and the Liturgy* (Notre Dame, IN, 1956).

¹⁹¹ S.J.P. Van Dijk, “The Bible in Liturgical Use,” in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. G.W. H. Lampe, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1969), ii, 220–52, esp. 221–2.

¹⁹² A.G. Martimort, “A propos du nombre des lectures à la messe,” *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 58 (1984), 42–51.

¹⁹³ OR I:20, 38.

¹⁹⁴ “Le plus ancien ‘Comes’ ou lectionnaire de l’Eglise romaine,” ed. G. Morin, *Revue bénédictine*, 27 (1910), 41–74.

¹⁹⁵ See the Honorius mosaic in Ihm, *Programme*, 114–19, 142–3, plate 26, no. 1; also LP (Mommson), 186.

¹⁹⁶ D.J. Sheerin, “Sonus and Verba: Varieties of Meaning in the Liturgical Proclamation of the Gospel in the Middle Ages,” in *Ad litteram: Authoritative Texts and their Medieval Readers* (Notre Dame, IN, 1992), 29–69.

¹⁹⁷ Early Christians would read straight through Biblical books at liturgical services, and pick up wherever they had left off at the next liturgy. S. Beissel, *Entstehung der Perikopen*

although slightly more of the New Testament (and the Gospels in particular) would be incorporated.¹⁹⁸

The reasons why certain pericopes were assigned to certain feast days is not always entirely obvious. In some cases, it was because of a thematic connection with the day being celebrated. For example, the Gospels read on Christmas Eve and Christmas Day relate to Jesus' conception and birth.¹⁹⁹ The Gospels of Easter Week recounted what occurred to Jesus and the Apostles after the resurrection: the empty tomb and Jesus' appearances to his followers.²⁰⁰ The stational churches contributed to determining the choice of readings.²⁰¹ The Gospel reading with the Samaritan woman at the well was likely chosen for reading at San Lorenzo in Lucina because there was a well in that church.²⁰² The Gospel of the waking of Lazarus was an ideal selection for the station at Saint Eusebius, since the church was constructed above a huge necropolis on the Esquiline Hill.²⁰³ In three cases, the readings corresponded to the patron saints of the titular churches where the

des römischen Messbuches: zur Geschichte der Evangelienbücher in der ersten Hälfte des Mittelalters (Freiburg im Breisgau and St. Louis, 1907); Jungmann, *MS*, i, 510–11.

¹⁹⁸ For the readings for this period, see "Le plus ancien 'Comes'" for the first reading; and *Das römische Capitulare evangeliorum*, Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen und Forschungen, 28, ed. T. Klauser (Münster and Westphalia, 1935) for the Gospels. Felix Just calculated statistics that give an approximate idea for how much of the Bible was used in the sixteenth-century lectionary – for his results, see <http://catholic-resources.org/Lectinary/Statistics.htm>, accessed 1 July 2012. Only 1% of the Old Testament (excluding the Psalms) was read, whereas 16.5% of the New Testament was read. However, 22.4% of the Gospel was read. I thank Just for discussion of his findings and his permission to use them in print.

¹⁹⁹ Christmas Eve: Matthew 1:18–21, the conception of Jesus and announcement to Joseph; Midnight Mass: Luke 2:1–14, Jesus' birth; Christmas Mass at dawn: Luke 2:15–20, the announcement to the shepherds; and Christmas Mass during the day: John 1:1–14, the beginning of John's Gospel with Jesus as the Word.

²⁰⁰ Easter Sunday: Discovery of the empty tomb (Mark 16:1–7); Easter Monday: the disciples going to Emmaus (Luke 24:13–35); Easter Tuesday: Jesus' appearance to the Apostles (Luke 24:36–47); Easter Wednesday: Jesus at the Sea of Tiberias (John 21:1–14); Easter Thursday: Jesus' appearance to Mary Magdalene (John 20:11–18); Easter Friday: Jesus sends out the Apostles (Matthew 28:16–20); Easter Saturday: Jesus sends out the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles (John 20:19–23). There is evidence in design in the choosing of the first four readings. They follow a rough chronological order: the empty tomb; two appearances of Jesus that appear in the same Gospel chapter; and another appearance of Jesus, referred to as his third appearance after the resurrection (John 21:14).

²⁰¹ Grisar, *Missale*, 1–4; Willis, *Further Essays*, 78–85.

²⁰² The reading is John 4:5–42; it was read on the Friday after the Third Sunday of Lent. Grisar, *Missale*, 25–6; Willis, *Further Essays*, 82.

²⁰³ The reading is John 11:1–45; it was read on the Friday after the Fourth Sunday of Lent. Grisar, *Missale*, 20–21; Willis, *Further Essays*, 84.

papal liturgy was held.²⁰⁴ On Easter Monday, held at the church San Pietro in Vaticano, the epistle is a speech of Peter; for Easter Tuesday, held at the church San Paolo fuori le Mura, a sermon of Paul is used as an epistle; for Easter Thursday, held at Santi XII Apostoli, which contains the relics of the Apostles Philip and James, the Gospel story is of Philip's baptizing the Ethiopian eunuch. Easter Monday's example is particularly telling, because the verses read did not originally contain Peter's name: someone crafted a new opening for the reading to emphasize who was speaking.

There has been one curious omission in my discussion of the Mass up to this point. OR I makes no reference to the pope's giving a sermon. Does this silence signify that the pope really did not preach, or did OR I fail to mention it? Most of the tasks that OR I assigns concern ceremonial duties that were ambiguous as to who performed them. In the case of the sermon, however, there would have been no ambiguity as to who was to preach: the pope would have preached a sermon without any assistance. There is some evidence that might lead one to assume that seventh- and eighth-century popes preached. Two distinguished predecessors, Leo I (440–461) and Gregory I, were both known for the quality of their preaching. Gregory I had either personally delivered or had others read many of his own sermons during his pontificate,²⁰⁵ and what is more, in his *Pastoral Care*, he continually referred to preaching as one of the main tasks of a priest and provided advice on how best to do it.²⁰⁶ In two of the formularies from the *Liber diurnus*, the pope commanded bishops that preaching the faith was incumbent upon them.²⁰⁷ One of the themes that emerges from seventh-century papal letters is that bishops need to preach to their flocks.²⁰⁸ Finally, there is a contemporary sermonary for San Pietro in Vaticano, which included excerpts from patristic sermons.²⁰⁹ If the pope did not want to write his own sermon, he could have borrowed from others' words.

²⁰⁴ The readings are: for Easter Monday, Acts 10:37–43; for Easter Tuesday, Acts 13:16, 26–33; for Easter Thursday, Acts 8:26–40. Grisar, *Missale*, 75–8; Willis, *Further Essays*, 84.

²⁰⁵ Gregory I, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, ed. R. Etaix, CCL, 141 (Turnhout, 1999).

²⁰⁶ Gregory I, *Regula pastoralis*, ed. F. Rommel and trans. C. Morel, Sources chrétiennes, 381–382 (Paris, 1992), i, 148–54, 188–94, 234, 246, 250; ii, 358–60, 420–38, 492, 506, 518–22, 530–40.

²⁰⁷ *Liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum*, ed. H. Foerster (Bern, 1958), 128–32 (V73) = 238–42 (C67) = 363–69 (A62); 148–57 (V84) = 224–31 (C65) = 338–53 (A60).

²⁰⁸ P. Conte, *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei papi del secolo VII* (Milan, 1971), 72–5, 284–96.

²⁰⁹ G. Löw, "Il più antico sermonario di San Pietro in Vaticano," *Rivista di archeologia Cristiana*, 19 (1942), 143–84; A. Chavasse, "Le Sermonaire vaticane du VII^e siècle," *Sacris erudiri*, 23 (1978–1979), 225–89. This sermonary was primarily intended for the Divine Office.

In spite of these considerations, I do not think that the pope tended to deliver a sermon.²¹⁰ As strange as it may appear to a post-Reformation mentality in which the sermon is fundamental to worship, preaching was not a priority in the early medieval world.²¹¹ When it comes to the movement of the actors of the Mass, OR I is generally meticulous in its details, especially concerning the pope. It provides no details about carrying books or papyri that would contain a sermon. The service was already a very long one.²¹² The dialogue that the pope initiates in OR I:63 was very similar to the one found in OR I:107. In both cases, it seems that the pope concluded a long spoken part of the Mass, after which a flurry of activity began. Popes like Leo I and Gregory I are renowned for their production of sermons, yet the number of sermons they produced are few and occasional.²¹³ One should not assume that the clergy of the seventh and eighth centuries placed importance on the delivery of a sermon, an assumption that says more about the scholars who study this period than the people who lived during it.²¹⁴

Making Sense of the Mass

Although there was no sermon to define doctrine, those who are familiar with the Roman Mass might think that the chanting of the creed would fill this gap. Yet the creed did not become a part of the Roman Mass until the eleventh century.²¹⁵ In the early Middle Ages the creed was still primarily seen as a part of the baptismal liturgy.²¹⁶ The absence of a sermon and the creed, however, does not mean that there were no beliefs expressed through the Mass. There is some truth in the Latin phrase brought up in modern discussions of liturgy, *lex orandi, lex credendi*: roughly, that the prayer of the Church expresses its belief.²¹⁷ Just because there was no systematic exposition of faith does not mean that messages

²¹⁰ Atchley, *Ordo Romanus Primus*, 79–80; Duchesne, *Origines*, 181; Klauser, *Short*, 64; Mathews, “Early Roman Chancel,” 86.

²¹¹ R.E. McLaughlin, “The World Eclipsed? Preaching in the Early Middle Ages,” *Traditio*, 46 (1991), 77–122.

²¹² Klauser, *Short*, 64; Senn, *Christian Liturgy*, 185.

²¹³ McLaughlin, “The World Eclipsed?” 101–2.

²¹⁴ For example, H.A.J. Wegman, *Christian Worship in East and West: A Study Guide to Liturgical History*, trans. G.W. Lathrop (New York, 1985), 185: “Did the pope have other worries besides the preparation of his homily?”

²¹⁵ Froger, *Chants*, 25; Jungmann, *MS*, i, 601; McKinnon, *Advent Project*, 92.

²¹⁶ OR XI:61–7 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 433–7).

²¹⁷ P. de Clerck, “Lex orandi, lex credendi: Sens originel et avatars historiques d’un adage équivoque,” *Questions liturgiques*, 59 (1978), 193–212. In the original sense of the phrase, the faith communicated through liturgical formulae was always linked to Scripture and tradition.

were not communicated through the actions and words of the papal Mass. What then might one gain from attending a papal Mass in this period?

Some of the actions of the Mass would have indicated special regard for people and items.²¹⁸ This includes bowing to the altar²¹⁹ and to the pope.²²⁰ In other cases, the clergy would kiss things²²¹ like the altar,²²² the evangeliary,²²³ and the paten;²²⁴ and people like other clergymen²²⁵ or the feet of the pope.²²⁶ When acolytes held the evangeliary, chalice, and paten they could not touch them directly but had to cover their hands with their chasubles.²²⁷ The chalice and bread were elevated and the bread touched the chalice after the consecration.²²⁸ In the Mass in which a new pope is consecrated, deacons hold the evangeliary open over the head of the new candidate for pope.²²⁹ Presumably, these actions would all have translated into respect, if not reverence, for the items in question: things bowed to, kissed, or unable to be touched by members of the minor clergy were distinguished from mundane items. That the pope was also bowed to and his feet kissed would have singled him out among the clergy. The elevation of the bread and wine may have suggested its sanctity. The Kiss of Peace among the clergy might have created a sense (or appearance) of fraternity. Holding the book over the papal candidate would have shown honor to the Gospels and the pope, and suggested that the new pope would be guided by its words. It is impossible to say how anyone in the congregation would have construed these gestures, but this is likely the impression that they were intended to convey.

When it comes to the verbal content of the Mass, it is best to start at invariable chants and prayers said at every Mass. The repetition of these words would have made the congregation familiar with them, and the messages disseminated tended

²¹⁸ N. Mitchell, *Cult and Controversy: The Worship of the Eucharist outside Mass* (New York, 1982), 56–61.

²¹⁹ OR I:49, 85.

²²⁰ OR I:50, 52.

²²¹ I agree with Jungmann's suggestion that *saluto* in OR I implies kissing in MS, i, 406 n. 20.

²²² OR I:51. F.J. Dölger, "Zu den Zeremonien der Messliturgie II: Der Altarkuss," *Antike und Christentum*, 2 (1930), 190–221, at 192–3, 197–8.

²²³ OR I:51, 59; Van Dijk, "Bible," 229–30; N. Gussone, "Der Codex auf dem Thron: zur Ehrung des Evangelienbuches in Liturgie und Zeremoniell," in *Wort und Buch in der Liturgie*, ed. H.P. Neuheuser (St. Ottilien, 1995), 191–231, at 203–7.

²²⁴ OR I:94.

²²⁵ OR I:49, in which the pope kisses the major clergy; OR I:96, which is the general Kiss of Peace among the clergy.

²²⁶ OR I:59.

²²⁷ OR I:30, 60, 67, 91.

²²⁸ OR I:89–90. The elevation also may have been done to make them visible to the congregation: Klauser, *Short*, 66.

²²⁹ OR XLA:5 (*Les Ordines Romani*, iv, 297).

to be very few and simple. Rather than state beliefs like a creedal statement, they largely imply beliefs in passing, ones that many Christians would already have held. For example, unchangeable prayers imply belief in God and the Trinity;²³⁰ the passion, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus;²³¹ and the existence of angels and saints.²³² It presupposes knowledge of Old Testament figures.²³³ It also gives some idea of the relationship between God and the congregation. The faithful were God's holy people.²³⁴ God could be asked to receive and bless the gifts of bread and wine, an offering that would in turn help to protect and govern the Church.²³⁵ The most recurrent message was that God must be given glory, praise, and gratitude.²³⁶ The repetition of this theme may result from an ancient stratum of texts, in which Mass was conceived of primarily as a *sacrificium laudis* ("sacrifice of praise"), an opportunity to thank God for his works.²³⁷

In time, several instances of sacrificial language of the more usual variety would grow up in Eucharistic prayers.²³⁸ Although there was no formal theological theory about the nature of sacrifice until the twelfth century, the implication of the terminology is that the priest by his role in celebrating the Mass atoned to God for human sinfulness.²³⁹

As with gestures, it is impossible for us to gauge how the faithful would have received these messages. Few in Rome at the time were able to engage in high theology, but at least some of the ideas transmitted through the Mass were basic and easy to absorb. I am more optimistic than Robert Taft in his appraisal of how

²³⁰ *L'ordinaire*, 60 (*Gloria patri*).

²³¹ *L'ordinaire*, 80 (*Unde et memores*).

²³² *L'ordinaire*, 74 (common preface); *L'ordinaire*, 76, 78 (*Communicantes*); *L'ordinaire*, 84 (*Nobis quoque*).

²³³ *L'ordinaire*, 82 (*Supra quae*), which mentions Abel, Abraham, and Melchisedech.

²³⁴ *L'ordinaire*, 80 (*Unde et memores*).

²³⁵ *L'ordinaire*, 74, 76 (*Te igitur*), 78 (*Hanc igitur, Quam oblationem*), 82 (*Supra quae*).

²³⁶ *L'ordinaire*, 62, 64 (*Gloria in excelsis Deo*); 74 (*Sanctus*); 77 (common preface); 84 (*Per quem*); 90 (*Ite Missa est*).

²³⁷ The term is used directly in the *Memento* (*L'ordinaire*, 76). E.J. Kilmartin, "Sacrificium Laudis: Content and Function of Early Eucharistic Prayers," *Theological Studies*, 35 (1974), 268–87; J.A. Jungmann, "Von der 'Eucharistia' zur Messe," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 89 (1967), 29–40, at 29–33.

²³⁸ M.P. Ellebracht, *Remarks on the Vocabulary of the Ancient Orations in the Missale Romanum* (Nijmegen, 1963), 75–80. Gregory I was influenced by the liturgical language of sacrifice in his discussion of the consecration. E.J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*, ed. R.J. Daly (Collegeville, MN, 1998), 22, 76.

²³⁹ Two theological works that are historically informed on this theme are M. McGuckian, *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass: A Search for an Acceptable Notion of Sacrifice* (Chicago and Leminster, 2005); and R.J. Daly, *Sacrifice Unveiled: The True Meaning of Christian Sacrifice* (London and New York, 2009), 14–22, 118–25.

much the laity could understand in medieval liturgy.²⁴⁰ There is no guarantee that those in attendance actually agreed with all of the simple doctrines that undergirded these chants and prayers. As a study of later medieval religion has shown, there were still those who expressed disbelief in the face of Christian teaching.²⁴¹ Most would say, however, that the form or ritual of the Mass was far more important for early medieval religion than theology or doctrine.²⁴² Naturally, some might have rejected worship and its efficacy outright. One blasphemer in a miracle story of Artemios mocked participants in the liturgy and suggested the saint could not aid them, only to discover he too would soon need a miraculous healing.²⁴³

Participation of the Laity in the Mass

Historians of the liturgy affirm the commanding role that the clergy played in worship, and generally believe that the laity had little to no active role. The common opinion is best summarized in an introduction to the form of Western liturgy: "The medieval liturgy had little place for the active involvement of the laity. Their role was passive and devotional."²⁴⁴ Medieval worship seems only a stone's throw from the Roman Catholic Mass that persisted from the Council of Trent (1545–1563) until the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965), which was reformed precisely because there was little interaction between the clergy and the "alienated" worshipping community.²⁴⁵ Historians of the liturgy have been virtually unanimous in declaring that the laity did not participate in the papal liturgy in the seventh and eighth centuries or, if they did, their participation was so limited as to be inconsequential.²⁴⁶ If the laity had little active involvement in

²⁴⁰ R.F. Taft, *Through Their Own Eyes: Liturgy as the Byzantines Saw It* (Berkeley, 2006), 128–31.

²⁴¹ J.H. Arnold, *Belief and Unbelief in Medieval Europe* (London and New York, 2005), 216–30.

²⁴² A. Angenendt, *Geschichte der Religiosität im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 1997), 351–5, 383–7. L.K. Little, "Romanesque Christianity in Germanic Europe," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 23 (1993), 453–74.

²⁴³ *Miracles of St. Artemios: A Collection of Miracle Stories by an Anonymous Author of Seventh Century Byzantium*, ed. and trans. V.S. Crisafulli and J.W. Nesbitt, *The Medieval Mediterranean*, 13 (Leiden and New York, 1997), 102–9.

²⁴⁴ Harper, *Forms*, 40.

²⁴⁵ C. Vogel, "An Alienated Liturgy," *Concilium*, 72 (1972), 11–25.

²⁴⁶ Among many examples, see Angenendt, *Frühmittelalter*, 247–8 ("Das Volk verharnte weitgehend inaktiv"); Crocker, *Introduction*, 114 ("... the choir sings on behalf of the people"); Duchesne, *Origines*, 179–80; *Eglise en prière*, 295–6; Hiley, *Western Plainchant*, 151–2; Jungmann, *MS*, i, 97 and ii, 162; Klauser, *Short*, 66 (parenthetically!)

the action of the Mass, they had even less in the musical performance: chanting of the Psalms was a popular activity in the fourth and fifth century, but by the seventh century, it was the preserve of monastic and clerical choirs.²⁴⁷

A closer look reveals an unappreciated level of lay involvement. The papal Mass was a popular event, well attended by Romans. One of the letters of Pope Martin I (649–655) makes reference to the large crowd that would gather in churches on Sundays.²⁴⁸ Gregory I mentioned how many people had gathered for his sermon but warned them about how few people would ultimately be saved.²⁴⁹ The Council of Trullo (691–692) urged the participation of the faithful during Easter Week, although some of them preferred alternative entertainment like races or other spectacles to attending Mass.²⁵⁰ Rome was well equipped to handle crowds. Its churches housed huge numbers: for example, Santa Maria Maggiore could hold 2,732 people, the original San Pietro in Vaticano could hold at least 9,000 people, and the Basilica of the Savior could hold 5,483 people.²⁵¹

The papal Mass was designed to allow people to witness and become involved in it. The liturgy was celebrated facing the laity, and they could see everything that was happening in the Mass.²⁵² The language employed for the celebration was Latin, which was not a dead language but instead the common tongue. The people heard all the prayers in the Mass, even the most sacred Eucharistic orations of the Canon.²⁵³ They petitioned the pope for prayers on his way to the church, received Communion, and (at least in the case of nobles) ate with the

“the congregation at Papal masses did not take part in any chants”; G. Scheibelreiter, “Church Structure and Organisation,” in *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Volume 1, c. 500–c. 700*, ed. P. Fouracre (Cambridge, 2005), 675–709, at 700; Van Dijk, “The Bible,” 252; Wegman, *Christian Worship*, 184–5.

²⁴⁷ P. Jeffery, “Monastic Reading and the Emerging Roman Chant Repertory,” in *Western Plainchant in the First Millennium: Studies in the Medieval Liturgy and its Music*, ed. S. Gallagher, J. Haar, J. Nádas, and T. Striplin (Aldershot and Burlington, VT, 2003), 45–103.

²⁴⁸ *Narrationes de exilio sancti papae Martini*, ed. and trans. in B. Neil, *Seventh-century Popes and Martyrs: The Political Hagiography of Anastasius Bibliothecarius* (Turnhout and NSW, Australia, 2006), 174.

²⁴⁹ Gregory I, *Homiliae*, 148 (sermon 19).

²⁵⁰ *The Council in Trullo Revisited*, ed. G. Nedungatt and M. Featherstone (Rome, 1995), 148–9.

²⁵¹ Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 139 n. 2 (Basilica of the Savior); i, 388, n. 3 (Santa Maria Maggiore); ii, 505 (San Pietro in Vaticano).

²⁵² Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 82.

²⁵³ R.F. Taft, “Was the Eucharistic Anaphora Recited Secretly or Aloud? The Ancient Tradition and What Became of It,” in *Worship Traditions in Armenia and the Neighboring Christian East* (Crestwood, NY, 2006), 15–57, esp. at 34–41; R. Cabié, *The Eucharist*, trans. M.J. O’Connell, *The Church at Prayer*, 2 (Collegeville, MN, 1986), 133. Only one prayer is explicitly said quietly: the prayer said over the deacon before he reads the Gospel (OR I:59).

pope after Mass.²⁵⁴ The elite laity donated money to the Church that funded the foundation and upkeep of churches and the purchase of moveable goods.²⁵⁵

The generosity of Roman nobles extended to the context of the Mass. They would contribute bread and wine that would be handed over to the clergy during the offertory.²⁵⁶ Unlike earlier Christian practice, the only gifts that the clergy accepted for the altar were bread and wine, not other foodstuffs.²⁵⁷ This was before the offering became commuted to money: the clergy at this time still received real bread and wine that would immediately be used for the sacrifice.²⁵⁸ Roman women baked the bread used for Communion in their own homes and brought it to church, as becomes clear from an early-eighth-century biography of Gregory I written by an anonymous monk of the English monastery Whitby.²⁵⁹ In this story, a woman smiled upon receiving the Eucharistic bread, realizing it was the bread that she herself had baked. It is likely that the bread was baked in the form of a small wreath, as it was in the early-third century²⁶⁰ and the late-sixth century.²⁶¹ The bread at this time in Rome and throughout the West was still leavened; it is not until the ninth century that there is a certain attestation of the use of unleavened bread.²⁶² A stamp on the bread would show that it was designated for use in the Mass.²⁶³ Although it was the elite who normally provided gifts, Gregory I urged the poorer congregants to make a symbolic

²⁵⁴ OR I:12–13, 99, 113–18. For a later example comparable to petitioners' approaching the pope, see the biography of Gregory I by the anonymous monk of Whitby, in which Gregory summons a man to himself and speaks with him during a procession. *The Earliest Life of Gregory the Great by an Anonymous Monk of Whitby*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave (Cambridge, 1985), 114.

²⁵⁵ J. Hillner, 'Families, Patronage, and the Titular Churches of Rome, c. 300 - c. 600', in *Religion, Dynasty, and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300-900*, ed. K. Cooper and J. Hillner (Cambridge and New York), 225-61.

²⁵⁶ OR I:69, 74.

²⁵⁷ A. Angenendt, "Das Offertorium: In liturgischer Praxis und symbolischer Kommunikation," in *Zeichen – Rituale – Werte: Internationales Kolloquium des Sonderforschungsbereichs 496 an der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität Münster*, ed. G. Althoff and C. Witthöft (Münster, 2004), 71–150, at 92–3; Klauser, *Short*, 65. Clearly this custom still persisted in some places: The Council in Trullo forbade people to bring grapes or milk and honey to offer at the altar (*Council in Trullo Revisited*, 102–3, 138).

²⁵⁸ Jungmann, *MS*, ii, 28–30. Cf. Angenendt, *Frühmittelalter*, 248.

²⁵⁹ *Earliest Life*, 106–7.

²⁶⁰ LP (Mommsen), 20. Beissel, *Bilder*, 316; Jungmann, *MS*, ii, 41–2; Klauser, *Short*, 67.

²⁶¹ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, ed. A. de Vogüé, trans. P. Antin, Sources chrétiennes, 251, 260, 265 (Paris, 1978–1980), iii, 186 ("duas ... oblationum coronas").

²⁶² Angenendt, "Offertorium," 83; Jungmann, *MS*, ii, 43–4. In the eleventh century, unleavened bread became universal in the West: Cabié, *Eucharist*, 132–3.

²⁶³ G. Galvaris, *Bread and the Liturgy: The Symbolism of Early Christian and Byzantine Bread Stamps* (Madison, 1970).

offering of the heart.²⁶⁴ It is possible that bread in excess of what was needed for Mass was not consecrated but offered to the poor.²⁶⁵

Because OR I, like other liturgical documents, is chiefly interested in the behavior of the clergy, these are the few occasions in which one hears about the laity, since the laity is only mentioned when they interact with the pope and his ministers. It is not an anthropological document intended to detail the level of involvement of the laity in full.

The text of OR I presupposes that the reception of Communion by the laity was a common and uncontroversial feature of the Mass, in contrast to approximately the tenth century when the reception of Communion by the laity became highly restricted.²⁶⁶ The distribution of Communion was such a regular event that the exarch Olympius could plan to kill Pope Martin I when he was distributing it.²⁶⁷ In addition, it is clear from both OR I and the Roman miracle of St Anastasius that people received both the bread and the wine.²⁶⁸ OR I does not mention how the faithful in Rome received, and some scholars think it was in their hands.²⁶⁹ Elsewhere in the seventh century they certainly did: the Council of Trullo mentioned people receiving in their hands.²⁷⁰ The trend in the period as a whole, though, was for the clergy to put Communion directly in the mouth of the laity because of a growing feeling of respect for the Eucharist and unworthiness and impurity among recipients.²⁷¹ Two hagiographical

²⁶⁴ Gregory I, *Homiliae*, 35 (sermon 5).

²⁶⁵ Fortescue, *Mass*, 299; Jungmann, *MS*, ii, 11–12; Saxer, *Sainte-Marie-Majeure*, 120; Wegman, *Liturgie*, 229.

²⁶⁶ P. Browe, “Die Pflichtkommunion der Laien im Mittelalter,” in *Die Eucharistie im Mittelalter: Liturgiehistorische Forschungen in kulturwissenschaftlicher Absicht* (Münster, 2003), 39–49; *idem*, “Die öftere Kommunion der Laien im Mittelalter,” in *ibid.*, 67–88; Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 99; Jungmann, *MS*, ii, 450. I am not convinced as Jungmann says that Rome held on to a practice of lay participation longer than anywhere else. With the paucity of sources, it is impossible to prove whether Rome is the exception or the rule.

²⁶⁷ LP (Mommsen), 183.

²⁶⁸ *Saint Anastase le Perse: et l'histoire de la Palestine au début du VII^e siècle*, ed. B. Flusin, 2 vols (Paris, 1992), i, 173 (Greek version); C.V. Franklin, *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian: Hagiographic Translations and Transformations*, Studies and Texts 147 (Toronto, 2004), 351 (Latin version); Fortescue, *Mass*, 176.

²⁶⁹ Angenendt, *Frühmittelalter*, 248; Froger, *Chants*, 37–8; Klauser, *Short*, 68. The Council in Trullo (*Council in Trullo Revisited*, 138–9) forbade the laity from serving themselves Eucharist if there were a bishop, priest, or deacon present. If there were an occasion in which they could communicate themselves, the laity could touch the Eucharist.

²⁷⁰ *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 181–3.

²⁷¹ B. Caseau, “L’abandon de la communion dans la main (IV^e–XII^e siècles),” in *Mélanges Gilbert Dagron*, ed. G. Dagron and V. Déroche (Paris, 2002), 79–94, although most of her examples derive from Syria and Palestine.

tales from Rome portray the celebrant directly putting Eucharist into people's mouths,²⁷² and this was likely the norm in Rome. The clergy and laity sipped wine through liturgical straws.²⁷³ At least some people did not want to receive Communion, and instead simply left the church before it was distributed.²⁷⁴ Communion was believed to have the power to sanctify one's body: a Roman monk in this period asked a demon how he dared to enter a little girl that was a consecrated vessel, since she had received the body and blood of Christ.²⁷⁵ It could perform healing miracles, such as healing a lame and mute man.²⁷⁶ At least some people must have tried to bring the Eucharist home.²⁷⁷ This may have been a reaction against the residual practice of private reception of the Eucharist from the ancient world,²⁷⁸ but some of the clergy may also have feared its employment in magic.²⁷⁹ The clergy probably felt the temptation to withhold Communion from those who had not been generous to the Church. The Council of Trullo ordered that Communion be given freely, and no one who distributed it could exact any payment.²⁸⁰

Romans were enthusiastic about offering prayer to God and combining their petitions with elaborate gestures.²⁸¹ During Mass it is likely that the laity participated in dialogues with the pope.²⁸² This would have been particularly easy in the case of the collect, prayer over the offerings, and final prayer, which always have the same ending, and thus provide a prompt for when the people have to respond. In some cases, OR I simply gives the response to something the celebrant said, which means that it is just as likely that the laity as the clergy responded.²⁸³ Seven groups of the laity answered "Amen" to the pope's final

²⁷² Gregory I, *Dialogi*, ii, 268, 270; *Earliest Life*, 106–7.

²⁷³ Atchley, *Ordo Romanus Primus*, 111; Jungmann, *MS*, ii, 475–6.

²⁷⁴ Klauser, *Short*, 67.

²⁷⁵ *Saint Anastase le Perse*, 173; cf. Franklin, *Latin Dossier*, 351.

²⁷⁶ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, ii, 268, 270.

²⁷⁷ *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 181–3, warns against this practice.

²⁷⁸ D. Callam, "The Frequency of Mass in the Latin Church ca. 400," *Theological Studies*, 45 (1984), 613–50, at 615–26.

²⁷⁹ P. Browe, "Die Eucharistie als Zaubermittel im Mittelalter," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 10 (1930), 134–54, and reprinted in his *Die Eucharistie im Mittelalter*, 219–31.

²⁸⁰ *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 98.

²⁸¹ Gregory I, *Homiliae*, 236 (sermon 27). For discussion of this passage and the culture of prayer in Rome, see my Chapter 5 below.

²⁸² For a similar view, see *Eglise en prière*, 295–6; Froger, *Chants*, 34, 17, 43. Pace Jungmann, *MS*, i, 93.

²⁸³ OR I:53 after the collect; OR I:107 after the *Fiat commixtio*; and OR I:63 after "Dominus vobiscum." It is clear that OR I:63 is directed to a group, whereas OR I:107 ("Pax tecum") seems only to be directed towards the archdeacon.

benediction.²⁸⁴ In the baptismal liturgy, the laity was expected to respond to the prompts given by the clergy.²⁸⁵

Two anecdotes from the *Liber pontificalis* are further evidence that the laity was in the habit of taking part in brief verbal exchanges with the pope.²⁸⁶ All people were said to have responded “Amen” to Pope Vigilius’ (537–555) prayer as he was being abducted to Constantinople.²⁸⁷ The people and the clergy are said to have prevented Pope Eugene I (654–657) from continuing to celebrate Mass in Santa Maria Maggiore until he promised to reject the doctrine of Patriarch Peter of Constantinople.²⁸⁸ For the purposes of this argument, it is not important whether or not this scene took place as it is described in the *Liber pontificalis*. If it was thought that the laity could stop the progress of a Mass with their interjections, it seems that they were in the habit of responding vocally to the pope at Mass – perhaps too enthusiastically at times!

This brings us to the question of the laity’s participation in the sung part of the Mass. My examination of the evidence suggests that they had a role in chanting.²⁸⁹ Certain chants might have been too technically difficult for the average Roman,²⁹⁰ but this is not true for all of them. The laity could have joined in the four chants sung at every Mass: the *Kyrie*, the *Gloria in excelsis Deo*, the *Sanctus*, and the *Agnus Dei*. These would have been familiar to the Roman audience, and would have been easy to learn and repeat. All four have an archaic character and are variations on the same basic melody.²⁹¹ In contrast, it is doubtful that the laity would have taken part in the unfamiliar chants sung only on specific liturgical days. It is possible that some of the laity could have participated in chanting the response of the gradual by hearing and repeating what the cantor sang, but the sources only focus on the soloist and choir trading off their parts.²⁹² In OR I the cantor ascended the steps to deliver

²⁸⁴ OR I:126: The monks, *schola cantorum*, *draconarius* soldiers, porters, candle-bearers, cross-carriers, and junior sextons.

²⁸⁵ OR XI:11, 26, 87, 91, 101 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 420, 424, 444, 445, 446).

²⁸⁶ These are one example of what R.L. Crocker refers to as “liturgical sentences.” Crocker, *Introduction*, 103–8.

²⁸⁷ LP (Mommsen), 152.

²⁸⁸ LP (Mommsen), 185.

²⁸⁹ For a study that is optimistic about the participation of the laity in chanting, see Crocker, *Introduction*, 115, 118, 125–6.

²⁹⁰ *Eglise en prière*, 296.

²⁹¹ G. Kiss, “Ordinary Melodies in the Context of the ‘Old Roman Chant,’” in *Essays in Honor of László Somfai: Studies in the Sources and the Interpretation of Music*, ed. L. Vikárius and V. Lampert (Lanhan, MD, 2005), 19–44.

²⁹² Hesbert, “Le graduel, chant responsorial,” 320–21; Huglo, “Le répons-graduel de la messe,” 68–9.

his part,²⁹³ which was undoubtedly so he could be heard more easily by the faithful,²⁹⁴ whether or not they responded to him.

A careful reading of contemporary sources proves the laity's part in chanting. The biography of Pope Xystus I (117–126) says that when he instituted the *Sanctus*, the priest would intone it, and then the people would chant it.²⁹⁵ This notice would still have made sense to the clerical scribe who wrote it down in the mid-sixth century. In a seventh-century formulary for letters, the *Liber diurnus*, one letter assumes that the recipient would chant the chant *Gloria in excelsis Deo* to demonstrate unity with the pope.²⁹⁶ Gregory I said that the *Kyrie* is sung by the clergy, and then the people respond to it.²⁹⁷

The clearest proof for the laity's participation comes in the chant in the biography of Pope Sergius I, which says that the *Agnus Dei* was to be sung by the clergy and the people.²⁹⁸ This evidence is particularly strong. The text was produced during the reign of Sergius I, the same pope who instituted the chant, and was written and read by the clergy of the Lateran. If there were any text that would minimize the role of the laity in the liturgy, it would be this one. Yet this notice of lay participation is included without further commentary in the midst of the many accomplishments of Sergius' reign. If this was seen as a normal facet of the chants of the Mass, then I see little reason to suppose that the laity refrained from taking part in the other invariable chants as well. In OR I:87–8 there is no indication of who chants the *Sanctus*: it is equally likely that the “they” who chant it is not only the choir, but the congregation too. After the communal chant *Sanctus*, the pope alone (*solus*) delivered the Canon.²⁹⁹

Some scholars have claimed that there is a contradiction between Gregory I's letter and the performance in OR I of the *Kyrie*,³⁰⁰ and between the biography

²⁹³ OR I:57.

²⁹⁴ Cf. the two instances in the *Liber pontificalis* when popes suspected of wrongdoing ascended ambros to prove that they were not guilty of the accusations against them. In both cases, they specifically note that the people were present when they did so: LP (Mommsen), 155; LP (Duchesne), ii, 7.

²⁹⁵ LP (Mommsen), 11.

²⁹⁶ *Liber diurnus*, 159–60 (V85) = 233–4 (C66) = 355–7 (A61).

²⁹⁷ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 586–7.

²⁹⁸ LP (Mommsen), i, 215: “Hic statuit, ut tempore confractionis dominici corporis agnus dei qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis a clero et populo decantetur.” For a rare scholar who correctly takes these words at face value, see É. Ó Carragáin, *Ritual and the Rood: Liturgical Images and the Old English Poems of the “Dream of the Rood” Tradition* (London, Toronto, and Buffalo, NY, 2005), 163.

²⁹⁹ Jungmann, *MS*, ii, 130.

³⁰⁰ Jungmann, *MS*, i, 441; McKinnon, *Advent Project*, 86–7.

of Sergius I and OR I:105, in which the choir chants the *Agnus Dei*.³⁰¹ OR I does not, in fact, preclude the participation of the laity in either of these chants. The choir might have led the chant, but there was nothing to stop the laity from joining in.

Three comparable bodies of evidence strengthen the case for lay participation in the Mass in Rome. It is telling that the Council in Trullo only regulates *how* the laity is to chant in church: the underlying implication was that the laity of the Byzantine Empire was already chanting in churches and that this practice was viewed as acceptable.³⁰² Robert Taft has compiled several instances of participation throughout the history of the Byzantine Empire that suggest that the impression from this one document is correct.³⁰³ The Byzantine laity had numerous ways in which to participate during Mass: they sang, listened to the homily, performed the Kiss of Peace, prayed out loud, received Communion; and they frequently joined in processions. To provide one contemporary Byzantine example, the laity in the miracle collection of Artemios frequently took part in all-night vigils, chanting hymns and taking part in processions.³⁰⁴ In addition, in the Frankish Kingdom of the sixth and seventh centuries, the laity participated in the responses, some chants, and the *Pater noster*, in addition to performing the Kiss of Peace and giving offerings.³⁰⁵ Even in late medieval England, there were a number of ways in which the laity took part in worship: seeing the Eucharistic host, especially at the moment of consecration; doing devotional reading at Mass; kissing a communal *Pax*-board at the Kiss of Peace; and walking in processions.³⁰⁶

It is too easy to look back at medieval forms of participation from a modern perspective and anachronistically to find them lacking. These attitudes stem from the sixteenth-century debate between Catholics and Protestants.³⁰⁷ While these sides diverged on much, they agreed that medieval worship practices were deficient. Eventually both sides would (with varying degrees of success) promote forms of worship that would require the laity to increase their participation and to understand what they were doing. The Protestant side would go one

³⁰¹ W. Apel, *Il canto gregoriano: Liturgia, storia, notazione, modalità e tecniche compositive*, trans., rev., and updated by M. Della Sciucca (Lucca, 1998), 592 n. 10; Atchley, *Ordo Romanus Primus*, 5; Froger, *Chants*, 36; Hiley, *Western Plainchant*, 165–6.

³⁰² *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 156–7.

³⁰³ Taft, *Through Their Own Eyes*, esp. 29–67, 75–121.

³⁰⁴ *Miracles of St. Artemios*, 102–3, 115, 117, 191, 206–9.

³⁰⁵ G. Nickl, *Der Anteil des Volkes an der Messliturgie im Frankenreiche von Chlodwig bis Karls den Grossen* (Innsbruck, 1930).

³⁰⁶ E. Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, 2nd edn (New Haven, 2005), 91–130.

³⁰⁷ N.D. Mitchell, “Reforms, Protestant and Catholic,” in *The Oxford History of Christian Worship*, ed. G. Wainwright and K.B. Westerfield Tucker (Oxford and New York, 2006), 307–50, at 309–11.

step further and break down the barriers that existed between clergy and laity, requiring that everyone in attendance at church services assume a greater role in and responsibility for the success of the worship. People in the medieval world would have been surprised to learn that they had no substantial part in the liturgy. The laity in late medieval France, for instance, simply had a different idea of what participation was.³⁰⁸ Inspired by lay prayer books, they fulfilled their distinct role in the Mass: viewing the elevation of the host, exchanging the Kiss of Peace, and receiving regular (i.e. non-Eucharistic) bread blessed by the priest. Rather than contemplate theology, they gazed at symbols and performed gestures. This last point merits special emphasis. Ritual studies stress the centrality of the body to the worship experience.³⁰⁹ Given this, it would be strange to judge participation based on either vocal performance or intellectual appreciation alone.

Reception of the Papal Mass

The Roman Mass in this period as preserved in OR I has in later centuries been viewed as something of a golden age for the Mass. OR I was exported to Francia and now exists in whole or in part in 28 manuscripts, which is why it can be discussed in such detail despite the absence of any Roman copy.³¹⁰ In the past, scholars exaggerated OR I's importance in either Rome or greater Western Europe. One should show caution in supposing that one document was all-important in Rome or somehow imposed the Roman liturgy everywhere in Europe.³¹¹ Yet the papal Mass in OR I is part of a larger story of the transmission of Roman liturgy. Beginning with the Carolingians, the Roman liturgy would come to be seen as the ideal form of liturgy, even if there was never a sustained program of reform of Frankish liturgy on a Roman standard.³¹² Though its full effect would not be felt for centuries and it was never copied in all its details,

³⁰⁸ V. Reinburg, "Liturgy and the Laity in Late Medieval and Reformation France," *Sixteenth-Century Journal*, 23 (1992), 526–47.

³⁰⁹ C.M. Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (New York, 1992), esp. 98–101.

³¹⁰ *Les Ordines Romani*, i, 3–27.

³¹¹ R.E. Reynolds, "The Organisation, Law and Liturgy of the Western Church, 700–900," in *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Volume 2*, 587–621, at 618; S.J.P. Van Dijk and J. Hazelden Walker, *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy: The Liturgy of the Papal Court and the Franciscan Order in the Thirteenth Century* (Westminster, MD, 1960), 49.

³¹² Y. Hen, "The Romanization of the Frankish Liturgy: Ideal, Reality, and the Rhetoric of Reform," in *Rome across Time and Space: Cultural Transmission and the Exchange of Ideas c.500–1400*, ed. C. Bolgia, R. McKitterick, and J. Osborne (Cambridge and New York, 2011), 111–23.

aspects of the Roman Mass would become widely influential in Western Europe.³¹³ OR I was one of the documents that exported Roman liturgy into Northern Europe, and became more popular outside of Rome than in Rome.³¹⁴ Sometimes, borrowings from the papal Mass of OR I emerge in unexpected ways. The twelfth-century liturgy of the Cistercians had the celebrant pause in the midst of the procession to the altar as the pope did in OR I; but because the Cistercians did not have their celebrant bow his head to the host consecrated at an earlier Mass as the pope did, he instead substituted bowing in the direction of the altar.³¹⁵ The significance of OR I persists into more recent times. Since its rediscovery in the late-seventeenth century, scholars have repeatedly mined OR I for its reliable data on the Roman Mass.³¹⁶ The Roman rite, especially its early medieval form, has been lauded by one of the more famous historians of the liturgy as genius and hailed for its “soberness and sense.”³¹⁷ Most significant for modern worship, it has served as the model of reform of the Mass in the Second Vatican Council.³¹⁸

The later fame of OR I, and the Roman Mass more generally, should not obscure an understanding of the original document or its Roman context. What can one say about its initial effect in Rome? Since there are no eyewitness accounts of the papal Mass in this period, it cannot be known exactly how contemporaries would have viewed it. One can, however, suggest how these Masses fit into Roman society.

The style of papal liturgy in this period was ideal for a city, even if it was one with a modest population. The stational system and processions of the pope took advantage of the city's space. Further, cities like Rome tend to attract a diversity of people. Liturgy, with its wordless and symbolic expressions, must have been an effective way to communicate to people who did not all speak the same language or share the same customs.³¹⁹ Even for natives who spoke Latin, the array of sights and music in the Mass would have been helpful in keeping people's attention. Due to the large size of many of the churches used in the stational liturgy and the large crowds that attended them, many of those in attendance might not have heard the readings or prayers. Gregory I made

³¹³ H.B. Meyer, *Eucharistie: Geschichte, Theologie, Pastoral* (Regensburg, 1989), 400–440.

³¹⁴ Saxer, *Sainte-Marie-Majeure*, 126.

³¹⁵ Cf. OR I:48 and P. Tirot, *Un “ordo missae” monastique: Cluny, Cîteaux, La Chartreuse* (Rome, 1981), 45.

³¹⁶ Romano, “Fates of Liturgies,” 73–7.

³¹⁷ E. Bishop, *Liturgica Historica: Papers on the Liturgy and Religious Life of the Western Church* (Oxford, 1918), 1–19, with quotation at 19.

³¹⁸ J.F. Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to the Critics* (Collegeville, MN, 2008), 26.

³¹⁹ Baldovin, *Urban Character*, 254.

indirect reference to this possibility when he mentioned that his voice had lost power, and he was afraid the congregation could not hear him.³²⁰

The clergy and faithful of the seventh and eighth centuries were concerned about observing a strict outward form for their liturgies.³²¹ The celebration of the Mass was precisely planned and strictly ordered. The level of detail that OR I provides bespeaks an environment in which any kind of improvisation in the liturgy would have been unwelcome. Contemporary sources bear out this impression. One of the stories of the *Spiritual Meadow* complained about the bishop of Aegaion in Cilicia because he did not follow the standard order of a liturgical service.³²² In another of its tales, the rest of the clergy was astonished when the celebrant repeated the words of the Canon four times.³²³ A third story tells of a priest ordered by angels to use the correct, orthodox formulae to consecrate the Eucharist.³²⁴

It was a long, slow process for the parts of the Roman Mass to become hardened into a canonical form; this process is evident in the prayers of the Canon, which went from being extemporaneously delivered to a set pattern used at every Mass.³²⁵ The popes were instrumental in establishing the Roman method of worship. The *Liber pontificalis*, in addition to its catalogues of the donations, building projects, and ordinations made by the popes, indicates the changes dictated by them as heads of the public cult of Rome, even if it does not do so systematically or completely. Because these modifications have not been given much scholarly attention, a reader of the *Liber pontificalis* might be surprised to learn how often the pope instituted changes, of greater or lesser importance, to the liturgy of Rome,³²⁶ frequently introduced by the construction “*constituit ut*” (“he decreed that”). The papal liturgy was by no means fixed in stone by this period, and there continued to be additions and modifications. The latest addition to the Canon had been by Gregory I, who had edited the

³²⁰ Gregory I, *Homiliae*, 181 (sermon 22).

³²¹ J. Kramp, *Eucharistia: Essays on Eucharistic Liturgy and Devotion* (Saint Paul, MN, 1926), 40; Saxer, *Sainte-Marie-Majeure*, 123.

³²² John Moschos, *Spiritual Meadow*, PG, lxxxvii, 2873B–C.

³²³ John Moschos, *Spiritual Meadow*, PG, lxxxvii, 3013D, 3016A–C.

³²⁴ John Moschos, *Spiritual Meadow*, PG, lxxxvii, 3088A–C.

³²⁵ A. Bouley, *From Freedom to Formula: The Evolution of the Eucharistic Prayer from Oral Improvisation to Written Texts*, Studies in Christian Antiquity, 21 (Washington, DC, 1981).

³²⁶ For the 25 most significant changes made by papal initiative to the liturgy, see LP (Mommson) 4, 9, 10, 11 (twice), 12, 16, 18, 20, 37, 38, 46; LP (Geertman), 173–4, 190, 197, 198, 202, 204, 205, 212, 226; LP (Mommson), 161, 162, and 215; LP (Duchesne), i, 402. Only the last four of these occurred in the seventh and eighth centuries, suggesting that by this period, the popes had a large body of tradition on how to practice the public cult.

prayer *Hanc igitur*.³²⁷ Gregory had also changed the position of the *Pater noster* in the Mass.³²⁸ In 608 the Pantheon was converted to the church Santa Maria dei Martiri and incorporated into the stational system.³²⁹ Sergius I introduced the *Agnus Dei* into the Roman liturgy to be sung during the breaking of the Eucharistic bread.³³⁰ There were no liturgical celebrations on Thursdays in Lent until the time of Gregory II (715–731).³³¹

The clergy was more interested in the strict execution of the actions of the Mass than in the need to provide commentary on what they were doing. The author of OR I did not intend to explain the deeper meaning of the actions of the Mass but to describe their practical execution. The Mass itself offered no opportunity to explain what was happening. When interpretations for liturgical elements in the papal Mass do appear, they were added after they had left Rome and passed into the Frankish cultural sphere. The scribe of MS St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 614, for instance, tried to make sense of the bread that had been left on the altar by saying that the altar should never be without sacrifice, i.e. the consecrated bread.³³² The scribe provided a rationale for an action that is out of character with the rest of the flowchart-like OR I. One early medieval thinker who certainly had OR I (or at least a part of it) in front of him as he was writing was Amalar of Metz (c.775–c.850), a cleric active in the Frankish royal court, and the archbishop of Trier (804–814) and Lyons (835–838/9).³³³ Amalar was

³²⁷ LP (Mommsen), 161. Jungmann, *MS*, ii, 226; V.L. Kennedy, “The Pre-Gregorian ‘Hanc igitur,’” *Ephemerides liturgicae*, 50 (1936), 349–58; T. Michels, “Woher nahm Gregor d. Gr. die Kanonbitte: Diesque nostros in tua pace disponas?” *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 13 (1933), 188–90.

³²⁸ Willis, *Further Essays*, 179–84.

³²⁹ For the conversion of the Pantheon into Santa Maria dei Martiri, LP (Mommsen), 165. On the building, see W.L. MacDonald, *The Pantheon: Design, Meaning, and Progeny* (Cambridge, MA and London, 2002 [1976]) and F. Lucchini, *Pantheon* (Rome, 1996); for its career as a church, see V. Bartoccetti, *Santa Maria ad Martyres (Pantheon)*, Le chiese di Roma illustrate, 47 (Rome, 1958).

³³⁰ LP (Mommsen), 215; Jungmann, *MS*, ii, 413–22.

³³¹ LP (Duchesne), i, 402; M. Andrieu, “Les messes des jeudis de Carême et les anciens sacramentaires,” *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 9 (1929), 343–75.

³³² OR I:105 with n. 105 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 101): “... preter particulam quam pontifex de propria oblatione confracta super altare reliquit, quia ita observant, ut, dum missarum sollemnia peraguntur, altare sine sacrificio non sit.” Andrieu recognized this as an interpolation.

³³³ Amalar of Metz, *Amalarii episcopi opera liturgica omnia*. For background on Amalar, see A. Cabaniss, *Amalar of Metz* (Amsterdam, 1954). On Amalar’s method, see A. Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Liturgie und des religiösen Volkslebens* (Bonn, 2003 [1902]), 339–98; H. Schneider, “Roman Liturgy and Frankish Allegory,” in *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West: Essays in Honour of Donald A. Bullough*, ed. J.M.H. Smith (Leiden and Boston, 2000), 341–79.

a liturgical theorist, attempting to explain the components of the liturgy by means of an allegorical method. For instance, he cited OR I:95 to explain the unfamiliar Roman custom of the first *commixtio*, in which the celebrant first says a prayer and then lets the consecrated bread fall into the chalice; Amalar explained that when both bread and wine are effective in man, the Holy Spirit is present.³³⁴ The original Roman Mass spoke for itself and its original audience would not have anticipated any such parsing of its meaning.

The clergy not only provided no explanation for the Mass: they also did not act out a story. Whether or not one considers the Mass to be a dramatic experience depends largely upon one's definition of drama.³³⁵ It was certainly not intended to act out certain scenes in the Bible or in other sacred texts. The various components of the Mass were added and revised over the course of centuries and did not build a coherent narrative. The one exception to this rule, albeit an important exception, is the Institution Narrative.³³⁶ At this key part of the Mass, the priest narrates the story of the Last Supper and delivers Jesus' words in the first person, ritually imitating Jesus to bless the bread and wine.

Anyone watching the Mass would have been impressed by the cost of the production. The liturgy represented a considerable economic investment by the popes. Although there is no way to precisely measure the funds devoted to the liturgy, contemporary sources hint at its considerable expense. Gregory I had to arrange to have wooden beams shipped to him from southern Italy for the roofs of San Pietro in Vaticano and San Paolo fuori le Mura.³³⁷ The biographies of the popes in the *Liber pontificalis* became a form of papal propaganda,³³⁸ and one of the items the popes were praised for was their investment in liturgical furnishings and ecclesiastical renovations. Papal biographers listed their many donations of precious items to the main churches of the city. One can get a sense of this by examining the gifts given to San Pietro in Vaticano alone, which included candlesticks, thuribles, patens, chalices, flagons (*amulae*), and altar

³³⁴ *Amalarii episcopi opera*, ii, 361.

³³⁵ For different approaches to this question, see K. Young *The Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1933); O.B. Hardison, "The Mass as Sacred Drama," in *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages* (Baltimore, 1965), 35–79. Now see N.H. Petersen, "Liturgical Drama: New Approaches," in *Bilan et perspectives des études médiévales (1993–1998)*, ed. J. Hamesse (Turnhout, 2004), 625–44; *idem*, "Representation in European Devotional Rituals: The Question of the Origin of Medieval Drama in Medieval Liturgy," in *The Origins of Theater in Ancient Greece and Beyond: From Ritual to Drama*, ed. E. Csapo and M.C. Miller (Cambridge and New York, 2007), 329–60.

³³⁶ *L'ordinaire*, 80; Hardison, "Mass as Sacred Drama," 47–8.

³³⁷ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 675–8.

³³⁸ H. Geertman, *More veterum: Il Liber Pontificalis e gli edifici ecclesiastici di Roma nella tarda antichità e nell'alto medioevo* (Groningen, 1975), 2.

cloths, all decked out with precious metals.³³⁹ While renovations and donations beautified the churches, they were meant to equip the churches for use in the stationary liturgy; the same churches like San Pietro in Vaticano that featured prominently in the papal liturgy also appear in donation lists. One of the litany of evil deeds done by Emperor Constans II (641–668) in his trip to Rome in 663 was carrying off sacred vessels and other equipment from churches.³⁴⁰ This deed, like the new taxation he introduced (discussed immediately before his pilfering), was considered an economic loss.

The finds at Crypta Balbi give us an idea of how valuable the liturgical furnishings used in OR I must have been, and why it was important that the clergy keep careful watch over them: from the thuribles and covers of thuribles³⁴¹ to an ivory Gospel cover³⁴² to flasks used to carry holy oils³⁴³ to lamps used to light churches.³⁴⁴ The archaeological discoveries from Crypta Balbi further prove that the Church was one of the major sponsors of the production of precious items in the city,³⁴⁵ and that it was responsible for organizing the social and material fabric of urban life at Rome.³⁴⁶

Although the matter will be discussed further in the next chapter, it already becomes clear that the liturgy helped to establish the clergy, and the pope in particular, as leaders of the city. Whereas the ancient Christian liturgy of the city of Rome offered numerous opportunities for individuals' performing private prayer services in houses, including those led by women, by the fifth century the pope had largely monopolized the worship of the city.³⁴⁷ The effects of prayers were supposed to aid all Romans, but the celebrant was the one who prayed on behalf of them. This becomes clear in considering the direction of prayer. The celebrant was the only one who had to face to the sacred direction, the East.³⁴⁸

³³⁹ LP (Mommsen), 170, 176, 192, 203, 213–14, 219, 224–5; LP (Duchesne), i, 410, 417, 432.

³⁴⁰ LP (Mommsen), 187–8.

³⁴¹ *Roma dall'antichità al medioevo. Archeologia e storia nel Museo nazionale romano*, ed. M.S. Arena, P. Delogu, L. Paroli, M. Ricci, L. Saguì, and L. Vendittelli (Milan, 2001), 423–4.

³⁴² *Roma dall'antichità*, 425–6.

³⁴³ *Roma dall'antichità*, 475–6.

³⁴⁴ *Roma dall'antichità*, 429–32.

³⁴⁵ L. Saguì, "Roma, i centri privilegiati e la lunga durata della tarda antichità: Dati archeologici dal deposito di VII secolo nell'edera della Crypta Balbi," *Archeologia Medievale*, 29 (2002), 7–42, at 21–4, 29–36.

³⁴⁶ P. Delogu, "Roma dall'antichità al medioevo. La storia," in *Roma dall'antichità*, 13–19.

³⁴⁷ K. Bowes, *Private Worship, Public Values, and Religious Change in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge and New York, 2008).

³⁴⁸ OR I:51. C. Vogel, "Versus ad orientem: L'orientation dans les *Ordines romani* du haut moyen âge," *La Maison-Dieu*, 70 (1962), 67–99; *idem*, "Sol aequinoctialis: Problèmes et technique de l'orientation dans le culte chrétien," in *Actes du Colloque international*

Churches in Rome were generally built in the fourth century with their apses facing the West, so that the celebrant faces the East, the preferred direction of worship for ancient Christians; from the fifth to the eighth centuries, churches often had their apses in the East.³⁴⁹ This would allow light to stream in through the windows in the morning, exactly when Mass was being celebrated.³⁵⁰ It was unnecessary for the entire congregation to face the East. The celebrant prayed on behalf of the assembled faithful, and thus only he had to face the sacred direction.³⁵¹ Their roles in the liturgy would have marked the clergy and its servants as different from the rest of the populace. They walked in the main procession. Physically, the clergy were marked out in a special section; the bishops and priests were the only ones who could sit. They wore distinctive vestments.

The pope's liturgical role mediated his relationship with the city of Rome. The Mass allowed them to garner some of the secular authority that once belonged to the Roman government. Papal Masses and processions were among the means by which the popes claimed the city for themselves and transformed ancient Rome into a Christian city under the authority of the papacy.³⁵² Yet the liturgy also afforded opportunities to honor lay elites and incorporate them into the liturgy. This was especially true of the offertory, in which well-off Romans donated bread and wine. In one of the prayers of the Mass, the *Memento*, there was a space for the pope to announce the names of living worshippers who had contributed bread and wine to the Mass.³⁵³ This included parents who gave offerings as part of the requirements to have their children baptized.³⁵⁴ The candidates for baptism would be mentioned in the *Hanc igitur*.³⁵⁵ In the *Memento etiam*, the dead could also be prayed for, but this prayer was restricted to weekday Masses until the ninth century.³⁵⁶ The exchange of offerings from the laity for prayers and honor from the clergy might have created a sense of

d'archéologie paléochrétienne et culte chrétien: Revue des sciences religieuses, 36 (1962), 175–211; and the best survey currently available, S. de Blaauw, *Men het oog op het licht: Een vergeten principe in de oriëntatie van het vroegchristelijk kerkgebouw* (Nijmegen, 2000).

³⁴⁹ Blaauw, *Men het oog*, 17–25. The preference for worship towards the East can be seen in two stories in John Moschos, *Spiritual Meadow*, PG, lxxxvii, 2924D–25A–B and PG, lxxxvii, 2996C.

³⁵⁰ Blaauw, *Men het oog*, 39–42.

³⁵¹ Blaauw, *Men het oog*, 36–8.

³⁵² T.F.X. Noble, "Topography, Celebration, and Power: The Making of a Papal Rome in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries," in *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. M. De Jong and F. Theuvs (Leiden and Boston, 2001), 45–92.

³⁵³ *L'ordinaire*, 76; G.G. Willis, *Essays in Early Roman Liturgy* (London, 1964), 34–6.

³⁵⁴ OR XI:34 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 425).

³⁵⁵ OR XI:35 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 426).

³⁵⁶ *L'ordinaire*, 82, 84; Willis, *Essays*, 36–8.

cooperation with and allegiance to the papacy, exactly when the popes were in need of lay support to run the city in difficult times.³⁵⁷

The pope and the *vicedominus* would also dine with certain members of the laity after the end of Mass. It was considered an insult to decline an invitation to a bishop's dinner.³⁵⁸ OR I:99 shows that there were two separate meals after the papal Mass, one hosted by the pope and the other by the mayor of the palace, the *vicedominus*. Presumably both were held inside the Lateran, since the *vicedominus* was part of the papal household. There was almost certainly a difference in rank of those who were invited to each, although the document does not indicate who might find their way onto the invitation list. It is significant that people were invited by their names, not by their dignities, and were only invited during the course of the Mass. What this means is that the names of the guests could be changed depending on the political dictates of the moment, giving the pope and *vicedominus* latitude in deciding who would join them in dining. This is different from imperial dinners, which had precise, prepared lists of precedence for invitees, which dictated who was invited to the emperor's table and where they would sit once they arrived.³⁵⁹ The only chronologically proximate examples of the tradition of dining with the pope come during the reigns of Pope Vitalian (657–672) and Pope Zachary (741–752), and both of them dined with figures more exalted than the nobles of the city of Rome. Vitalian dined in the Lateran with Emperor Constans II,³⁶⁰ and Zachary dined with the Lombard King Liutprand (712–744).³⁶¹ The *Liber pontificalis* reports that the atmosphere of the second dinner had been particularly convivial.

The interaction with the emperor through the liturgy was a more complex matter. Terminology and concepts borrowed from the ancient Roman Empire survived in the Roman liturgy.³⁶² Some customs originated from Rome's more recent relationship with the emperor. There is a special Mass at dawn on Christmas day, which was an accommodation to the imperial authorities who lived on the Palatine Hill.³⁶³ This Mass was held in the church on the southwest slope of the Palatine, dedicated to St Anastasia, a martyr who had a cult in the

³⁵⁷ J. Dyer, "The Roman Offertory: An Introduction and Some Hypotheses," in *The Offertory and its Verses: Research, Past, Present and Future*, ed. R. Hankeln (Trondheim, Norway, 2007), 15–40.

³⁵⁸ John Moschos, *Spiritual Meadow*, PG, lxxxvii, 2881B–C, 2884A.

³⁵⁹ N. Oikonomidès, *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IX^e et X^e siècles* (Paris, 1972), 41–63, 65–235, 237–53, 255–77.

³⁶⁰ LP (Mommsen), 187.

³⁶¹ LP (Duchesne), i, 28.

³⁶² G. Tellenbach, *Römischer und christlicher Reichsgedanke in der Liturgie des frühen Mittelalters* (Heidelberg, 1934).

³⁶³ H. auf der Maur, *Feiern im Rhythmus der Zeit I: Herrenfeste in Woche und Jahr* (Regensburg, 1983), 169–70; P. Jounel, "The Year," in *The Liturgy and Time*,

East. Even if the Mass was no longer primarily for St Anastasia, the primary prayer formulae listed in the papal sacramentary for this day still referred to her.³⁶⁴

Some liturgical observances were intended for the well-being of the emperor. Until 800 the pope was a subject of the emperor and publicly prayed for him in the liturgy.³⁶⁵ Others did so as well: one of Gregory I's letters urged the Augustus Maurice to support impoverished nuns because they prayed for the Augustus and his offspring to flourish in government.³⁶⁶ The only prayer for the emperor that is preserved in the Gregorian Sacramentary is during the Universal Prayer on Good Friday.³⁶⁷ Since it is unlikely that the pope only prayed for the emperor on one day in the year, there was probably an original prayer for the emperor that fell out of the Gregorian Sacramentary after the papacy switched allegiance to the Frankish kings. The prayer was likely incorporated into the *Te igitur*.³⁶⁸ The Greek euchologion that was used in southern Italy, a region that remained loyal to the emperor, was never scrubbed of prayers for the emperor.³⁶⁹

Contemporaneously with praying for the emperor, the popes would also receive the images of the reigning emperor and empress and deposit them in the oratory dedicated to St Caesarius in the imperial residence on the Palatine Hill.³⁷⁰ The clergy and at least some of the elite people in Rome would accompany the pope in greeting the icons and acclaiming them in the Lateran as if the imperial couple themselves had visited Rome. Then they would place them on the altar in the oratory with candles burning on either side of them.³⁷¹ Prayer and reception of imperial likenesses demonstrated the pope's recognition of the empire's power

ed. A.G. Martimort, trans. M. O'Connell, *The Church at Prayer*, 4 (Collegeville, MN, 1986), 31–150, at 83.

³⁶⁴ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 101 (formulae 41 [C], 43 [OSO]), 102 (formulae 45, 47 [PC]).

³⁶⁵ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 685–7; Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, ed. L. Bethmann and G. Waitz, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Langobardicarum* (Hanover, 1878), 175–6. OR XV:129 (*Les Ordines Romani*, iii, 121) also implies that political leaders were prayed for at Mass, though the emperor is not mentioned and this note may be of Frankish origin.

³⁶⁶ Gregory I, *Registrum*, i, 296–7.

³⁶⁷ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 177 (formula 344).

³⁶⁸ Jungmann, *MS*, i, 68–70; ii, 197–9.

³⁶⁹ *L'Eucologio Barberini Gr. 336*, ed. S. Parenti and E. Velkovska, 2nd edn (Rome, 2000), 79 (formula 37, no. 4), 150 (formula 144, no. 3), 155 (formula 149), 166–7 (formula 158), 168–9 (formula 160), 178 (formula 171), 180 (formula 175), 181 (formula 176).

³⁷⁰ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 1101; Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, 175–6. A.T. Hack, "Bildaussendung und Bildeinholung im 7. und 8. Jahrhundert," *Saeculum*, 54 (2003), 147–78, at 151–9.

³⁷¹ For an idea of how the imperial portraits would have looked, see *Notitia dignitatum; accedunt Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae et laterculi prouinciarum*, ed. O. Seeck (Berlin, 1876), 8, 107.

over Rome. Deciding not to pray for or receive his images, as with any rejection of the emperor's will, would spell harsh repercussions for the pope, as Martin I discovered and Sergius I narrowly avoided.³⁷²

The emperor and the pope were bound to run into disputes regarding the liturgy, and this may be regarded as one of many areas in which their relationship began to break down. The Byzantine emperor occupied an anomalous position, maintaining a form of quasi-sacerdotal power and his own elaborate ceremonial.³⁷³ One of the liturgical manifestations of his special rights was that, unlike any other layman, he was allowed to enter the sanctuary to offer gifts.³⁷⁴ In Rome, the pope faced no such competition. Powerful laity was incorporated into the clergy; the laity did not enter the sanctuary, but handed their offerings to the clergy over the barrier that separated them.³⁷⁵ In the Byzantine Empire, and in Constantinople above all, the emperor and the Church were mutually interdependent: the emperor regularly intervened in the politics and theology of the ecclesiastical sphere and threatened or ousted the patriarch.³⁷⁶ The emperor's assertion of power in the ecclesiastical realm went beyond the imperial city. The imperially sponsored Council in Trullo attempted to force the entire empire into compliance with a set of liturgical norms, many of which ran against customs established in the eternal city.³⁷⁷ The resistance to the canons of this council was so great that Sergius I refused to sign them.³⁷⁸

If liturgy could be a bone of contention, popes could also draw upon it as a way to protest against imperial policy. To object to the heretical emperor Philippikos Bardanes (711–713), the pope refused to say public prayers for him or receive his images.³⁷⁹ In this case, the defense of orthodoxy was important enough to make the pope risk retaliation. There was likely another case of liturgical protest at Rome in this time. Sergius I objected to canon 82, one of the most noxious of the acts of the Council of Trullo, which forbade the depiction

³⁷² LP (Mommson), 182–4, 211–13.

³⁷³ G. Dagron, *Emperor and Priest: The Imperial Office in Byzantium*, trans. J. Birrell (Cambridge and New York, 2003).

³⁷⁴ *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 151; Dagron, *Emperor and Priest*, 110–13.

³⁷⁵ Mathews, "Early Roman Chancel," 90–93.

³⁷⁶ J.F. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century: The Transformation of a Culture* (Cambridge and New York, 1997), 281–6.

³⁷⁷ H. Ohme, "Die sogenannten 'antirömischen Kanones' des Concilium Quinisextum (692) – Vereinheitlichung als Gefahr für die Einheit der Kirche," in *Council of Trullo Revisited*, 307–21.

³⁷⁸ LP (Mommson), 211–12. J.M. Sansterre, "Le pape Constantin I (708–715) et la politique religieuse des empereurs Justinien II et Philippikos," *Archivum historiae pontificiae*, 22 (1984), 7–29, argues that Constantine I later accepted the canons of the Council in Trullo orally if not in writing.

³⁷⁹ Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, 175–6.

of Christ as a Lamb (an *Agnus Dei*) by inserting the chant *Agnus Dei* into the Mass.³⁸⁰ The *Agnus Dei* is often said to have stemmed from Sergius I's Syrian background.³⁸¹ His parents were seemingly refugees of the Muslim conquests who fled Antioch and moved to Palermo, where Sergius was born and raised.³⁸² However, it cannot be known how much Syriac (Western or Eastern rite) liturgy Sergius I consumed: there is no way to determine if his parents worshipped with a Syrian community in Palermo, and it is obvious that whatever his background, Sergius I became thoroughly integrated into Roman liturgy through his experience in the *schola cantorum*.³⁸³ As it is, the form of Syriac liturgy at this time is difficult to examine because few Syriac liturgical manuscripts predate or date to this period.³⁸⁴ References to lambs may well have already been a feature of the West Syrian rite practiced in Antioch,³⁸⁵ although no precise chronology exists of when they entered this tradition. Yet it is not necessary to posit any direct dependence upon a Syriac model. Both liturgical traditions could have independently borrowed from the Biblical text John 1:29. To my mind it is far simpler to argue that Sergius I took some words from the pre-existing Roman *Gloria in excelsis Deo* and refashioned them to form this new chant.³⁸⁶ The real innovation of the *Agnus Dei* is not that it has exotic origins, but that it retooled a portion of a familiar chant to stress the Lamb in a new way. There can be no definitive proof of Sergius' intentions, but a form of ritual protest is the most plausible suggestion.

Other evidence supports the view that the *Agnus Dei* was originally designed as a liturgical protest. There exists the possibility that to show his disapproval of canon 82, Sergius commissioned images of the *Agnus Dei* in the titular church Santa Susanna.³⁸⁷ Sergius might have been drawn to Santa Susanna as a staging-ground for a protest, given that Sergius had been the priest at this church before

³⁸⁰ Text in *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 162–4; LP (Duchesne), i, 381 n. 42; Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 414–16.

³⁸¹ For example, *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 48–51; Jungmann, *MS*, ii, 414–16; Batiffol, *Leçons*, 66.

³⁸² LP (Mommsen), 210.

³⁸³ LP (Mommsen), 210.

³⁸⁴ S. Brock, "Manuscrits liturgiques en syriaque," in *Les liturgies syriaques*, ed. F. Cassingena-Trévédy and I. Jurasz (Paris, 2006), 267–83.

³⁸⁵ Cf. the later Syriac references to lambs in *Liturgies, Eastern and Western, Being the Texts, Original or Translated, of the Principal Liturgies of the Church*, ed. F.E. Brightman (Oxford and New York, 1896), i, 71, 73, 84, 99.

³⁸⁶ Wagner, *Einführung*, i, 115; E. Foley, "The Song of the Assembly in Medieval Eucharist," in *Medieval Liturgy*, ed. L. Larson-Miller (New York, 1997), 203–34, at 209.

³⁸⁷ For the discoveries at Santa Susanna, see M. Cecchelli and M. Andaloro, "Santa Susanna," in *Roma dall'antichità*, 641–5; and M. Cecchelli et al., "Santa Susanna," in *Roma dall'antichità al medioevo II: contesti tardoantichi e altomedievali*, ed. L. Paroli and

becoming pope, and both the *Liber pontificalis* and an inscription detail his generosity towards it.³⁸⁸ This possibility is made more likely upon considering a precedent in the Byzantine world for changing parts of the sung Mass to express controversial belief. In the late-fifth century, the words “he who was crucified for us” were added to the *Sanctus* in certain cities, especially in Syria, because this chant was associated with a Monophysitical stance on Christology; this musical piece nearly caused riots.³⁸⁹ That some churches still sung this part nearly 200 years later is clear from the prohibition against this practice in the Council of Trullo.³⁹⁰ Finally, in early medieval Rome, images in churches had a part in political and theological debate, especially with the Byzantine world.³⁹¹

There remains skepticism among some scholars as to whether or not the insertion of the *Agnus Dei* was a protest.³⁹² Their arguments are worth spending some time with, since they expose some of the difficulties with bringing together the study of liturgy and history. Éamonn Ó Carragáin hypothesized that the *Agnus Dei* fulfilled the devotional needs of the Roman Church, and claimed that its longevity proved it could not have originated in a political crisis. Yet there is no way to tell what the spiritual needs of the laity were, and even less to discern how well a chant could have satisfied them. In addition, there is nothing to stop a liturgical practice stemming from politics from enduring as a part of the Mass for centuries, an argument that confuses the origin of a practice with its long-term effects. John L. Opie dismisses the possible polemical effect of the *Agnus Dei*, which leads him into missteps. His discussion of strict or lenient interpretations of canon 82 of the Council of Trullo, borrowed from canon 37, is inapplicable to canon 82; the Roman Church simply disobeyed canon 82. Even if the canons of the Council were later approved in Rome, they were initially rejected and this decision set a crisis into motion. Both authors explain the *Agnus Dei* as a Syrian tradition, which (even if it were) would not clarify why Sergius I added it to the Roman Mass. The implication of this position is that there could exist no rationale outside of a vague religious sense for adding elements to worship, an idea at odds with the value symbolic expressions in worship and art had for broadcasting controversial messages.

L. Vendittelli (Milan, 2004), 328–40. I find the most likely dating for this image to be in Sergius’ reign, though the debate has not been settled.

³⁸⁸ LP (Mommsen), 210, 215; for the inscription, see LP (Duchesne), i, 379–80.

³⁸⁹ S. Brock, “The Thrice-Holy Hymn in the Liturgy,” *Sobornost*, 7 (1985), 24–34, at 29; J.B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, 2 vols (Chicago, 1974 [1923]), i, 296–7.

³⁹⁰ *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 162.

³⁹¹ P.J. Nordhagen, “Early Medieval Church Decoration in Rome and ‘the Battle of Images,’” in *Ecclesiae Urbis*, iii, 1749–62.

³⁹² Notably, Ó Carragáin, *Ritual and the Rood*, 247–57; J.L. Opie, “*Agnus Dei*,” in *Ecclesiae Urbis*, iii, 1813–40.

Conclusion

In the seventh and eighth centuries, the Roman papacy possessed and continued to develop its own liturgy that responded to local needs. It was a medley of sights and sounds that combined the actions of the clergy, well-maintained churches, artwork, vestments, and expensive furnishings with Biblically based music and readings. Although much of the Mass might be classified as a victory of form over content – and certainly the absence of a sermon is striking – this form of worship would feature simple messages communicated through gesture, prayer, and chants. One cannot evaluate how the Roman congregation would have responded to the Mass, and different people must have experienced the liturgy in different ways,³⁹³ but as it was designed, the Mass could appeal to an audience that was diverse and craved a stream of new stimuli.

In many ways, the papal Mass in this period can be viewed as being the last glimpse at many liturgical forms associated with ancient liturgical practice: the participation of the faithful; real bread given in the offertory; prayers spoken out loud; and the Latin of the liturgy still spoken and understood by the people in attendance. In time, these practices would dwindle. I would resist the tendency to classify the liturgy of OR I as the exemplar of the medieval and later Masses, in which the faithful had no role except to be passive observers. My analysis has shown that the laity carried out liturgical actions, received the Eucharist, responded in dialogues, and even sang certain chants. The shift away from these practices in Rome is difficult to date precisely, because of a vacuum of liturgical sources in the following centuries.

Examining the papal Mass in this period reveals to us the priorities of the papacy. Though the popes of this period lacked the resources and clout of their successors, they funneled their economic and social capital into elaborate ceremonial. The meticulous attention to detail in OR I gives us an idea of the importance that the Mass held in the lives of the clergy and laity. Such rituals were central to the life of the papacy and its relationship with the people of Rome. Although the laity had a substantial role in the action of the Mass, there was no doubt that its leaders were the clergy, especially the pope. In a few cases, the capital gained by the papacy helped it to regulate and even protest against actions of the emperor. The following chapters will help us to deepen an understanding of the many other ways in which liturgy worked to create a distinctive early medieval Roman society.

³⁹³ McCall, *Do This*, 109.

Chapter 2

Shaping the Papal Court by Liturgy

The Liturgy of the Papal Court

As argued in the previous chapter, the liturgy of early medieval Rome played a central role in the life of the city, but nowhere was its influence felt so keenly as in the emerging papal court. Scholars have long been fascinated by the internal workings of court societies and their elaborate ceremonial.¹ Recently, John Osborne has turned his attention to the design of the pope's own court,² albeit without fully appreciating how liturgy functioned within it. Related studies have probed features significant for the operation of courts, especially the different methods employed to create and consolidate hierarchy and status.³ Another work suggested that late antique liturgy in Gaul helped to create new forms of leadership like bishops, which would supplant Roman models.⁴ Less attention has been paid to how the papal court and the liturgy intersected.

Past researchers have been disinclined to examine this subject in any detail. Louis Duchesne, a Catholic priest, seemed embarrassed by the pomp that developed around papal ceremonial and was determined to gloss over courtly ritual in favor of what he envisioned as the essential core of the Mass.⁵ Erich Caspar viewed the papal court and its pomp as a moral failing, revealing the extent to which the papacy had fallen.⁶ More recent scholars of ritual have at times unconsciously absorbed the bias against courtly liturgy and sustained the

¹ N. Elias, *Court Society*, trans. E. Jephcott (New York, 1983).

² J. Osborne, "Rome and Constantinople in the Ninth Century," in *Rome across Time and Space: Cultural Transmission and Exchange of Ideas, c.500–1400*, ed. C. Bolgia, R. McKitterick, and J. Osborne (Cambridge and New York, 2011), 222–36.

³ See the collection of studies in *Showing Status: Representations of Social Positions in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. W. Blockmans and A. Janse (Turnhout, 1999).

⁴ B. Jussen, "Liturgy und Legitimation, oder: wie die Gallo-Romanen das römische Reich beendeten," in *Institutionen und Ereignis. Über historische Praktiken und Vorstellungen gesellschaftlichen Ordens*, ed. R. Blänker and B. Jussen (Göttingen, 1998), 75–136, at 84–5, 105–8.

⁵ L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien. Etude sur la liturgie latine avant Charlemagne*, 5th edn (Paris, 1925 [1889]), 172.

⁶ E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, 2 vols (Tübingen, 1930 and 1933), ii, 629.

illusion that one can draw a distinction between papal pomp and “pure” liturgy.⁷ Yet it does not advance historical understanding to condemn the papacy for having assumed the characteristics of a secular court or having employed the liturgy to assist in this task. The task here is to understand on its own terms how the liturgy shaped the papal court, not to judge it.

The most useful tool in trying to make sense of the papal court in this period is the late-seventh-century First Roman Ordo (OR I), the first extant Mass liturgy, although occasionally other sources will be of assistance. Scholars have often asserted that OR I is a court ceremonial,⁸ but this claim has not been adequately explored and demonstrated. It may serve us first to formulate a working definition of what a court is. Considering the characteristics of the late antique imperial court in Constantinople is helpful in this task, since both courts developed similar structures.⁹ Like the imperial court, the papal court was marked by one dominating, charismatic figure in the center – the pope. In the absence of any other strong local leader, the pope had become the *de facto* ruler of the city of Rome, and was surrounded by an extensive and complex

⁷ See, for example, A. Angenendt, *Das Frühmittelalter: die abendländische Christenheit von 400 bis 900* (Stuttgart, 1990), 248: “such a papal Mass threatened to become dominated by foreign (*verfremdenden*) elements”; Jungmann, *MS*, i, 95–6; T. Klauser, *A Short History of the Western Liturgy: An Account and Some Reflections*, trans. J. Halliburton (London, 1969), 69; P. Llewellyn, *Rome in the Dark Ages* (London, 1971), 126, who referred to the papal Mass in this period as a “ceremonial ... whose splendour was directed towards the person of the pope ... rather than the sacramental Mass itself”; V. Saxer, “Le stazioni romane,” in *La comunità Cristiana di Roma*, ed. L. Pani Ermini and P. Siniscalco (Vatican City, 2000), 461–72, at 471–2.

⁸ For example, Angenendt, *Frühmittelalter*, 247–50; Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, ii, 627–30; P. Llewellyn, “The Roman Church in the Seventh Century: The Legacy of Gregory the Great,” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 5 (1974), 363–80, at 379; and *idem*, “The Popes and the Constitution in the Eighth Century,” *The English Historical Review*, 101 (1986), 42–67, at 44; T.F.X. Noble, “Rome in the Seventh Century,” in *Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies on his Life and Influence*, ed. M. Lapidge (Cambridge, 2005), 68–87, at 82; J. Richards, *Consul of God. The Life and Times of Gregory the Great* (London and Boston, 1980), 121; Saxer, “Le stazioni,” 472.

⁹ For this paragraph, see Angenendt, *Frühmittelalter*, 244; A. Demandt, *Geschichte der Spätantike: Das römische Reich von Diocletian bis Justinian, 284–565 n. Chr* (Munich, 1998), esp. 231–43; M. McCormick, “Emperor and Court,” in *The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume 14*, ed. A. Cameron et al., 3rd edn (Cambridge, 2000), 135–63; E. Stein, “La période byzantine de la papauté,” *Catholic Historical Review*, 21 (1935), 129–63, at 154–5. On imperial ceremonial, see O. Treitinger, *Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reichsidee nach ihrer Gestaltung im höfischen Zeremoniell*, 2nd edn (Darmstadt, 1956). For the social aspects of court life in Byzantium, see A.P. Kazhdan and M. McCormick, “The Social World of the Byzantine Court,” in *Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204*, ed. H. Maguire (Washington, DC, 1997), 167–97.

entourage. The men who composed it were assigned administrative tasks and were organized into compartmentalized bureaux in order to help him govern the city. Interaction among the members of the court was regulated and ritualized by ceremonial. These rituals lent special power to the pope and communicated the relative precedence of the people who participated in them. The pope interacted with those outside the court through Masses, processions, and acts of charity. The nerve center or palace of the papal court was the Lateran, from where the papal processions started out and where councils were held. The papal court was already in an advanced stage of development in the mid-seventh century, as can be seen from acts of the Council of 649. Members of the papal entourage appear in it, as do their formalized responses and ritualized activity.¹⁰

Similar to the imperial court in Constantinople, the structure of the papal court and its ceremonial found its roots in the later Roman Empire from the third to seventh centuries. Even as the centralized power of the Roman state disintegrated, the new societies that sprang up in its place were highly influenced by later Roman models of leadership, bureaucracy, and ritual.¹¹ One of the main features of the period was a blurring of military and civil spheres.¹² This was especially true of the Italian peninsula in the seventh century, since a military elite had seized power and governed civil administration.¹³ Civilians armed themselves like soldiers; civil servants imitated forms of military organization and dress. The pervasive influence of the military extended into the liturgy. OR I borrows military terminology,¹⁴ as did Roman prayers.¹⁵ In one case, a group

¹⁰ *Concilium Lateranense anno 649 celebratum*, ed. R. Riedinger, in *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, Series secunda, 1 (Berlin, 1984).

¹¹ M. Heinzelmann, *Bischofsherrschaft in Gallien: Zur Kontinuität römischer Führungsschichten vom 4. bis zum 7. Jahrhundert: Soziale, prosopographische und bildungsgeschichtliche Aspekte* (Zürich, 1976); A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602: A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1964), esp. i, 321–55, 363–92, 563–606; M. McCormick, *Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium, and the Early Medieval West* (Cambridge, 1986); *idem*, “Clovis at Tours. Byzantine Public Ritual and the Origins of Medieval Ruler Symbolism,” in *Das Reich und die Barbaren*, ed. E.K. Chrysos and A. Schwarz (Vienna, 1989), 155–80; J.M.H. Smith, *Europe after Rome: A New Cultural History, 500–1000* (Oxford, 2005); E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-empire*, 2 vols (Paris, 1959); *idem*, *Opera minora selecta* (Amsterdam, 1968).

¹² A. Demandt, “Der spätrömische Militäradel,” *Chiron*, 10 (1980), 609–36; R. MacMullen, *Soldier and Civilian in the Later Roman Empire* (Cambridge, 1963); C. Wickham, *The Inheritance of Rome: Illuminating the Dark Ages* (New York, 2010), 141–8.

¹³ T.S. Brown, *Gentlemen and Officers: Imperial Administration and Aristocratic Power in Byzantine Italy A.D. 554–800* (London, 1984), esp. 46–60, 101–8, 205–8.

¹⁴ J.F. Romano, “Announcing the Station in Early-Medieval Rome,” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 51 (2009), 345–51, at 348.

¹⁵ M.P. Ellebracht, *Remarks on the Vocabulary of the Ancient Orations in the Missale Romanum* (Nijmegen, 1963), 173–8.

in the procession was in the army. The closing procession of OR I included *draconarius* soldiers, officers of the Roman army who were present in the city of Rome because it was still under the dominion of the emperor.¹⁶ The *draconarii* were one form of standard-bearers in the Roman army.¹⁷ They carried a *draco* (dragon), which was attached to the end of a long staff and had either the head of a serpent or a wolf and a body of multicolored cloth. When the bearer moved with the standard, it appeared to move and made a hissing sound.

The long reach of the Roman army extended to how people thought about their world. The obsession with ranking and the highly structured behavior of the military spread to the populace at large.¹⁸ People began to place great value on status, hierarchy, and ritualized manifestations of precedence. This does not mean that the papal court imported without modification later Roman ways of acting and thinking, only that these ways of thinking played themselves out in particular permutations in the papal court. The clergy of Rome borrowed its vestments from late imperial magistrates.¹⁹ Many of the administrative positions of the late antique government moved into the Roman clergy with the same names and often the same functions.²⁰

This kind of military precision manifested itself in the liturgy as well. Early medieval religious practice was highly ritualized.²¹ The elite members of late antique Rome were extremely concerned with the proper outward forms of ceremonies. Members of the papal court in particular believed that they should be arranged in a particular order.²² The word used frequently to describe the proper arrangement of elements is *ordo*, a word that translates as

¹⁶ Brown, *Gentlemen and Officers*, 59. L. Duchesne, "Les régions de Rome au moyen-âge," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'Ecole française de Rome*, 10 (1890), 126–49, at 129–32, is surely correct to see the *draconarius* soldiers as carrying military, as opposed to ecclesiastical, standards.

¹⁷ For *draconarii* and *dracones*, see J.C.N. Coulston, "The 'draco' standard," *Journal of Roman Military Equipment Studies*, 2 (1991), 101–14.

¹⁸ For a classic work on ranking in the Roman army, see A. von Domaszewski, *Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres*, ed. B. Dobson, 2nd edn (Cologne and Graz, 1967).

¹⁹ T. Klauser, "Der Ursprung der bischöflichen Insignien und Ehrenrechte," *Bonner Akademische Reden*, 1 (1948), 5–44.

²⁰ For examples of titles of civil officials later appearing in the clergy, see Demandt, *Geschichte*, 235–49; Jones, *Later Roman Empire*, i, 363–73, 567–72, 590–91; Stein, *Histoire du Bas-empire*, i, 50, 112; Stein, *Opera minora selecta*, 239–51.

²¹ See, for instance, A. Angenendt, *Geschichte der Religiosität im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 1997), 37, 40, 108, 116–18, 134, 213, 380, 383–7, 478, 531; J. Martínez Pizarro, *A Rhetoric of the Scene: Dramatic Narrative in the Early Middle Ages* (Toronto and Buffalo, NY, 1989), 144–5.

²² See, for instance, Llewellyn, "Roman Church," 365.

order, arrangement, rank, disposition, grouping, composition, or plan.²³ The term *taxis* had many of the same meanings in the Greek-speaking world.²⁴ The term *ordo* in the Middle Ages had the meaning of the proper functioning of different elements of society as a harmonious whole.²⁵ Starting in the late-sixth century, this word also acquired a technical sense as a liturgical script.²⁶ The Latin term *ordo* appears frequently in OR I, indicating the proper arrangement of how actions are to be performed and people lined up.²⁷ The recurrence of the term in different permutations in OR I reveals how all-encompassing the interest in the correct order of liturgy was. The other *ordines* repeat this word as well: for instance, at two points in the baptismal liturgy, people are instructed to be ordered in order!²⁸ The interest in order extended beyond the liturgy. The participants of the Council of 649 frequently requested that the proceedings be conducted in order, and the clergy supposedly in attendance at the gathering were explicitly listed according to their ecclesiastical order.²⁹ The frequent and repetitive application of references to order sheds light on the importance contemporaries lent to carrying out their liturgy in a particular sequence, and the need they felt for order in a broader sense. The theoretical underpinning of this interest and the language used to express it were drawn from the Bible and the liturgy. The noun *ordo* is found frequently in the Vulgate, often referring

²³ U. Keudel, "Ordo nel 'Thesaurus linguae latinae,'" in *Ordo: Atti del II colloquio internazionale. Roma, 7-9 gennaio 1977*, ed. M. Fattori and M. Bianchi, Lessico intellettuale europeo, 20 (Rome, 1979), 13-22; C. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. and rev. W.G. Storey and N.K. Rasmussen (Washington, DC, 1986), 135. For the history of the word, see P. Van Beneden, *Aux origines d'une terminologie sacramentelle: Ordo, ordinare, ordinatio dans la littérature chrétienne avant 313*, Etudes et documents, 38 (Louvain, 1974), 1-4, 12-49, 140-44.

²⁴ M. McCormick, "Taxis," in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A.P. Kazhdan, 3 vols (New York, 1991), iii, 2018; A.P. Kazhdan and G. Constable, *People and Power in Byzantium: An Introduction to Modern Byzantine Studies* (Washington, DC, 1982), 60-61, 134, 158; C. Mango, *La civiltà bizantina*, trans. P. Cesaretti (Rome and Bari, 1998), 39, 175-7, 248; R.F. Taft, *Through Their Own Eyes: Liturgy as the Byzantines Saw It* (Berkeley, 2006), 133-58.

²⁵ O.G. Oexle, "Ordo, Ordines I," in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, ed. R. Auty et al., 10 vols (Munich and Zurich, 1977-1999), vi, 1436-7.

²⁶ Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 136.

²⁷ OR I:1, 4 (four times), 5 (twice), 34 (twice), 43 (four times), 45, 64, 69, 75, 86 (twice), 96, 110, 118.

²⁸ OR XI:83, 100 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 443, 446): "... ordinentur per ordinem ...", "... ordinantur per ordinem ...".

²⁹ *Concilium Lateranense anno 649 celebratum*, 28-9, 36-7 (twice, including "kata taxin/secundum ordinem"), 48-9 ("kata taxin/secundum ordinem"), 118-19 ("tên taxin/in hoc ordine"), 128-9, 132-3, 190-91, 192-3, 216-17, 338-9, 384-5 (twice).

to the proper arrangement of aspects of the cult or ministers.³⁰ For the papal court the ultimate source of the ecclesiastical order, and likely the more comprehensive ordering of society, was God.³¹

Ordering the Clergy through the Liturgy

Many things in the Rome of the seventh and eighth centuries were conceptualized in a standard order. The denizens of heaven were listed in a regular progression. In the Eucharistic prayers of the Canon, the saints were listed in a hierarchical order; Gregory I (590–604) deliberately rearranged this list from an older grouping of saints.³² A similar order of saints can be found in the *Liber pontificalis*.³³ The churches in the city in Rome were always listed according to a unified administrative order; the number and significance of liturgical celebrations held in each of these churches corresponded to their importance.³⁴ The kind of vestments one put on was intimately connected with the dignity of the wearer. Only the pope and those to whom he granted permission could wear the pallium; deacons were required to remove their chasubles after the initial procession and before the start of Mass.³⁵ The people in this society also had to be properly arranged. It is telling that Gregory I, when discussing the priests of ancient Israel in his commentary on Ezekiel, attempted to discern their hierarchy:³⁶ there was a basic expectation that members of the clergy were ordered in some fashion. It has been claimed that early medieval Romans

³⁰ See, for example, Exodus 28:17, 28:20, 39:10, 39:13, 40:21, 40:23; Leviticus 17:15; Numbers 7:5; Deuteronomy 15:2; Psalms 109:4; Luke 1:8; 1 Corinthians 14:40, 15:23; Colossians 2:5.

³¹ *Concilium Lateranense anno 649 celebratum*, 384–5: “eis ēn eklēthē para tou kuriou taxin/in quo vocatus est a domine ordine”; Gregory I, *Moralia in Job*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL, 143, 143A, 143B (Turnhout, 1979–1985), i, 806. In Byzantium, the heavenly order was thought to be reflected in the earthly order of the court and its rituals. See Kazhdan and Constable, *People and Power*, 60–61, 158.

³² V.L. Kennedy, *The Saints of the Canon of the Mass*, 2nd edn (Vatican City, 1963), 69–73.

³³ LP (Duchesne), i, 416, 421.

³⁴ H. Geertman, *More veterum: Il Liber Pontificalis e gli edifici ecclesiastici di Roma nella tarda antichità e nell'alto medioevo* (Groningen, 1975), 102–29; *idem*, *Hic Fecit Basilicam: Studi sul Liber pontificalis e gli edifici ecclesiastici di Roma da Silvestro a Silverio*, ed. S. de Blaauw and C.E. van der Laan (Leuven, Paris, and Dudley, MA, 2004), 17–44, 292.

³⁵ J. Braun, *Die liturgische Gewandung im Occident und Orient: Nach Ursprung und Entwicklung, Verwendung und Symbolik* (Freiburg im Breisgau and St. Louis, MO, 1907), 157 (chasubles), 639–42 (pallium); P. Conte, *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei papi del secolo VII* (Milan, 1971), 218–20.

³⁶ Gregory I, *Homiliae in Hiezechibelem prophetam*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL, 142 (Brepols, 1971), 387.

observed the Indo-European scheme of warriors, clergy, and people/farmers.³⁷ While Romans of this time would have recognized a distinction among these broad categories, much like the later classification of “those who pray,” “those who fight,” and “those who work,” it would be too reductive to state that this was the only or even primary fashion for separating and ordering groups in the Rome of this period.³⁸ Their world was infinitely more complicated, and the papal entourage in particular was delineated by liturgy into a subtler order.

The increasing complexity of the papal court was likely one of the reasons that the papal ministers chose to commit OR I to writing. The Easter liturgy in particular detailed in OR I depended on maintaining an appropriate order, since it was when the pope distributed new honors and positions.³⁹ The brand of militarized, regimented order was on display in ritual. Liturgical documents and liturgies themselves were not intended merely to describe an existing reality, but also to create a new order in the papal court and Rome as a whole. It was particularly significant for processions that centered on the pope rather than more popular processions that took place in Rome, in which the pope was a prominent participant but not the absolute culmination.⁴⁰ Several specific strategies were brought to bear to craft and enforce order through papal liturgy.

The most obvious trend is that the planners of worship intended to order bodies. People lined up for papal liturgies in a pattern meant to demonstrate

³⁷ E. Patlagean, “Les armes et la cité à Rome du VII^e au IX^e siècle, et le modèle européen des trois fonctions sociales,” *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome: Moyen Age – Temps Modernes*, 86 (1974), 25–62. This scheme was followed by Brown, *Gentlemen and Officers*, 129.

³⁸ G. Constable, *Three Studies in Medieval Religious and Social Thought* (Cambridge and New York, 1995), 251–66. For criticism of the applicability of this model in early medieval Rome, see P. Toubert, “*Scrinium et Palatium*: La formation de la bureaucratie romano-pontificale aux VII^e–IX^e siècles,” in *Roma nell'alto medioevo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, 48, 2 vols (Spoleto, 2001), i, 57–120, at 80.

³⁹ LP (Mommsen), 203.

⁴⁰ For this distinction, see J.F. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stational Liturgy*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 228 (Rome, 1987), 234–8; S. de Blaauw, “Contrasts in Processional Liturgy: A Typology of Outdoor Processions in Twelfth-Century Rome,” in *Art, cérémonial et liturgie au moyen âge: Actes du colloque de 3^e Cycle Romand de Lettres Lausanne-Fribourg*, 24–25 mars, 14–15 avril, 12–13 mai 2000 (Rome, 2002), 357–94; *idem*, *Cultus et decor: Liturgia e architettura nella Roma tardoantica e medievale*, *Studi e Testi*, 355–6, 2 vols (Vatican City, 1994), i, 73–4; *idem*, “Following the Crosses: The Processional Cross and the Typology of Processions in Medieval Rome,” in *Christian Feast and Festival: The Dynamics of Western Liturgy and Culture*, ed. P. Post, G. Rouwhorst, L. van Tongeren and A. Scheer (Leuven, 2001), 319–43; H.A.J. Wegman, *Christian Worship in East and West: A Study Guide to Liturgical History*, trans. G.W. Lathrop (New York, 1985), 33–4.

their relative precedence.⁴¹ These can be reconstructed precisely from OR I, which avoids the idealizing portraits of the world and archaic holdovers found in some *ordines*.⁴² Careful rules governed how people were ordered in processions, during the holding of hands known as the *sustentatio*,⁴³ and at the altar. A careful examination of OR I shows that this order has nothing to do with the antiquity of different corporations within the papal court.⁴⁴ To get a tangible sense of the organization, it is helpful to chart the order in which the ministers stood: Figure 2.1 shows seven cases from OR I.⁴⁵

The patterns presented in these seven orders seem disparate, but three broad tendencies can be discerned in them. First of all, the people walk in descending order of their rank, as seen in OR I:8–11, OR I:45–6, and OR I:125–6. In OR I:8–11, the pope breaks this general trend. In this case, the ordering from higher to lower only begins again after the pope has been listed.⁴⁶ This decision had both symbolic and practical significance. The pope is at the center of this procession, much as he was the center of the entire court. He is the bridge between the first six clergymen, who lived outside the Lateran palace, and the following four, who

⁴¹ Llewellyn, *Rome in the Dark Ages*, 114; V. Saxer, “La Chiesa di Roma dal V al X secolo: Amministrazione centrale e organizzazione territoriale,” in *Roma nell’alto medioevo*, ii, 493–637, at 504.

⁴² Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 102–3; R. Elze, “Die Herrscherlaudes im Mittelalter,” *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, kanonistische Abteilung*, 40 (1954), 201–23, at 216; *idem*, “Die päpstliche Kapelle im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert,” *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, 67 (1950), 145–204, at 161, n. 86; J.L. Nelson, “Ritual and Reality in Early Medieval *Ordines*,” in *The Materials, Sources, and Methods of Ecclesiastical History*, ed. D. Baker (Oxford, 1975), 41–51. Reprinted in J.L. Nelson, *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe* (London and Ronceverte, 1986), 329–40.

⁴³ E. Jerg, “Die ‘Sustentatio’ in der römischen Liturgie vor dem Hintergrund des kaiserlichen Hofzeremoniells,” *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 80 (1958), 316–24.

⁴⁴ Pace B. Schimmelpfennig, *Das Papsttum: Von der Antike bis zur Renaissance*, 4th edn (Darmstadt, 1996), 69.

⁴⁵ In OR I:29, the *sustentatio* ritual also takes place; the pope has a deacon on either side of him. I suspect that these were also the archdeacon and second deacon, but because they are not explicitly named by the text, I have omitted this instance.

⁴⁶ Cf. OR XX:7 (*Les Ordines Romani*, iii, 233–6, at 236). While power in the papal court and Roman society flowed from the pope, and closeness to him was a prerequisite for social advancement, closeness to the pope in the processions of OR I is *not* a prime indicator of rank (pace B. Schimmelpfennig, “Die Bedeutung Roms im päpstlichen Zeremoniell,” in *Rom in hohen Mittelalter: Studien zu den Romvorstellungen und zur Rompolitik vom 10. bis zum 12. Jahrhundert*, ed. B. Schimmelpfennig and L. Schmutge [Sigmaringen, 1992], 47–61, at 59). For example, in OR I:8–11, the deacon, who ranks higher than the regionary subdeacon, is farther away from the pope.

OR I:8–11

Deacon		Deacon
	<i>Primicerius</i> of the notaries	
Regionary notary		Regionary notary
Regionary <i>defensor</i>		Regionary <i>defensor</i>
Regionary subdeacon		Regionary subdeacon
	Stational acolyte (with chrism)	
Groom	POPE	Groom
	<i>Vicedominus</i>	
	<i>Vesterarius</i>	
	<i>Nomincolator</i>	
	<i>Sacellarius</i>	

OR I:45–6

Acolyte	Acolyte	Acolyte	Acolyte	Acolyte	Acolyte	Acolyte	Acolyte (with candles)
						Attendant subdeacon (with thurible)	
Second deacon		POPE					Archdeacon

OR I:69

<i>Primicerius</i> of the <i>defensores</i>	POPE	<i>Primicerius</i> of the notaries
---	------	------------------------------------

OR I:76

<i>Secundicerius</i> of the notaries	POPE	<i>Primicerius</i> of the notaries
--------------------------------------	------	------------------------------------

OR I:86

		[ALTAR]		
		POPE		
Second deacon	Bishop(s)	First bishop	Bishop(s)	Archdeacon

OR I:113

<i>Primicerius</i> of the <i>defensores</i>	POPE	<i>Primicerius</i> of the notaries
---	------	------------------------------------

OR I:125–6

Acolyte	Acolyte	Acolyte	Acolyte	Acolyte	Acolyte	Acolyte	Acolyte (with candles)
						Regionary subdeacon (with thurible)	
						POPE	
						Bishops	
						Priests	
						Monks	
						<i>Schola cantorum</i>	
						<i>Draconarius</i> soldiers	
						Porters	
						Candle-bearers	
						Acolytes who guard the gate	
						Cross-bearers	
						Junior sextons	

Figure 2.1 Order of processions in OR I

were members of the papal household:⁴⁷ the pope symbolically holds the two groups together. There was also the matter of security to take into account. It was a good idea to have ministers surrounding the pope to protect him, since he was vulnerable to attacks during public processions. The exarch Olympius planned to kill Pope Martin I (649–655) during Mass at Santa Maria Maggiore, a plan thwarted only by miraculous intervention.⁴⁸ Leo III (795–816) was ambushed during a liturgical procession for the Major Litany.⁴⁹ The pope is protected by the grooms around him in OR I:8–11, the ministers who accompany him during the *sustentatio*, and the *nomincolator* and the *sacellarius*, who intercept petitioners in OR I:13.

The second broad tendency is to favor the right side over the left side. Whenever right and left are mentioned, the right is listed first.⁵⁰ When two ministers hold the pope's hands, the higher-ranking one is on the right and the lower-ranking one is on the left. The composer of OR I explicitly specifies the distinction in two occasions.⁵¹ The pattern was assumed for OR I:29,⁵² OR I:76, OR I:86, and so right and left are not even mentioned. The ministers are simply listed in the proper order of their precedence, with the expectation that the first one would take the right hand and the second would take the left hand. This was so obvious to the composer of this document that he did not bother to repeat it after the first two times. The Roman liturgy thus took over the broad antique preference for the right hand and prejudice against the left hand,⁵³ a tendency that is cross-cultural and likely has biological roots.⁵⁴ This preference was also evident on a linguistic level in Latin and Greek, in which the words for right could mean fortunate or skillful. The Latin word for left was *sinister*, which also

⁴⁷ For this division, see T.F.X. Noble, *The Republic of St. Peter: The Birth of the Papal State, 680–825* (Philadelphia, 1984), 227; Saxer, "Chiesa di Roma," 524–7. This formulation is more precise than Schimmelpfennig, "Bedeutung," 59, who claimed that the ministers before and after the pope had different functions. While this is true, *all* of the pope's ministers were responsible for distinct tasks, and so this would not distinguish the two groups.

⁴⁸ LP (Mommsen), 183.

⁴⁹ LP (Duchesne), ii, 4–5.

⁵⁰ See OR I:8, 49, 55, 98, 101 (twice).

⁵¹ OR I:45–6, 69.

⁵² I suspect that, as in OR I:45–6, the two deacons who hold the pope's hands in this case are the archdeacon and second deacon, but the text does not specify their identity.

⁵³ O. Nussbaum, "Die Bewertung von Rechts und Links in der römischen Liturgie," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, 5 (1962), 158–71.

⁵⁴ *Right & Left: Essays on Dual Symbolic Classification*, ed. R. Needham (Chicago, 1973). The reason for preference for the right hand is potentially rooted in the development of the brain in the left cerebral hemisphere. This causes the development of muscles on the opposite side.

meant adverse or unfavorable.⁵⁵ The possibility of an inauspicious outcome for even saying the original Greek word for the left led Greek-speakers to substitute euphemisms for it.⁵⁶

The last general trend is that in processions, only ministers at a certain level of precedence are allowed to ride horses.⁵⁷ In OR I:7–11, the higher-ranking clergy rode horses, while the lower-ranking clergy went on foot.⁵⁸

Two additional organizing principles are at work in OR I:86. First, since the ministers in the diagram rank below the pope, they stand behind him. The second principle is that the higher one's station is, the closer one is to the pope and the Eucharist. This starts with the first bishop (*episcopus primus*), who stands behind the pope. Then, new ministers were added according to their rank, first on the right and then on the left. This holds not only for the bishops and deacons listed, but for the subdeacons and acolytes mentioned in OR I:88 and 101–2.

An aspect of OR I:8–11 and OR I:125–6 remains puzzling. Acolytes and a regionary subdeacon are at the head the procession in front of the pope. The most plausible explanation is that these ministers walk in this position by virtue of the furnishings they are carrying, since they obviously do not have precedence over the pontiff. The acolytes may precede the higher-ranking regionary subdeacon because they are carrying candles, ostensibly the first item in a procession. The rest of the procession mirrors OR I:8–11 in that the order listed is from higher to lower, broken up by the pope, and then continues again from higher to lower. In sum, if ministers were carrying liturgical items required for the processions, they were at times exempted from the normal rules dictating the order of precedence while walking.⁵⁹

⁵⁵ *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. P.G.W. Glare (Oxford and New York, 1996), 535 (*dexter*), 1769–70 (*sinister*); H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. Stuart Jones, and R. McKenzie, *Greek–English Lexicon*, ed. P.G.W. Glare and A.A. Thompson (Oxford, 1996), 379 (*dexios*). Modern English has, of course, retained the negative associations with the Latin word *sinister*.

⁵⁶ *Greek–English Lexicon*, 240, 740. They would use *euōnumios* (“the well-named side”) or *aristeros*, which is the comparative of the superlative for good (“the side that is better than the best”).

⁵⁷ V. Saxer, “L’utilisation par la liturgie de l’espace urbain et suburbain: L’exemple de Rome dans l’antiquité et le haut moyen âge,” in *Actes du XI^e Congrès international d’Archéologie chrétienne, Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève, et Aosta, 21–28 septembre 1986*, 3 vols (Rome, 1989), ii, 917–1031, at 951.

⁵⁸ On horseback were the pope, deacons, the *primicerius* of the notaries, regionary notaries, regionary *defensores*, regionary subdeacons, the *vicedominus*, the *vesterarius*, the *nomincolator*, and the *sacellarius*, while the acolytes and *defensores* walked on foot.

⁵⁹ This is likely the reason why the archdeacon holds the pope's left hand instead of the right in another ceremony (OR XXIII:11 in *Les Ordines Romani*, iii, 270–71): the pope was carrying a thurible in his right hand.

Grasping the engagement with the precious items required for the liturgy may also help us to better understand the particular ministers involved in OR I:125–6. Others might have taken part in the recession, but the list in OR I focuses on people who were carrying things or had a part in guarding the furnishings. After all, this was the end of the liturgy, and this would be exactly when the greatest danger of having one of the furnishings stolen existed. Thus, the acolytes were carrying candles; the regionary subdeacon was carrying incense; the members of the *schola cantorum* were likely carrying the antiphoner; the *draconarius* soldiers carried standards; the porters in OR I:21 carried precious items, and needed to restore them to the Lateran; the candle-bearers, as their name implies, carried the candelabra; the cross-carriers obviously carried the processional crosses; and the sextons in OR I:21 had seemingly taken things out of storage from the Lateran – they would likely be responsible for ensuring that they were restored there. It was imperative to have a precise idea of who was responsible for which items in order to hold them accountable for the precious objects' whereabouts. The acolytes in OR I:126 then had to close off the presbytery in order to prevent anyone from breaking in and stealing something.

The liturgy of OR I, then, created an entire ballet of precedence regulated by strict rules. Using urban ceremonial to promote a system of ranking would emerge as a recurrent feature in Europe.⁶⁰ But who in particular benefited from this liturgical ordering?

That the pope is at the top of the hierarchy is a given for the composer of OR I. He is the central figure in the document. Even when the liturgical action moves away from him for a short time, it moves back quickly. He is mentioned in a greater number of chapters than anyone else. He is given more titles than any other person in the liturgy, especially the term *apostolicus*, which referred to the apostolic lineage of his position.⁶¹ He is the only one who issues commands using the verb *iubeo* or the noun *iussum*.⁶² Physically, the pope was the center around which everyone else revolved: certain of his body parts are used as reference points to describe where people should stand.⁶³ Like all celebrants of

⁶⁰ E. Muir, *Civic Ritual in Renaissance Venice* (Princeton, 1981), 189–211; Noble, *Republic*, 223; M. Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge, 1991), 243–71, on hierarchies arranged around the Eucharist in late medieval Corpus Christi processions.

⁶¹ OR I:6, 9, 18. For contemporary use, see LP (Mommensen), 186–7; *The Earliest Life of Gregory the Great by an Anonymous Monk of Whitby*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave (Cambridge, 1985), 78, 82, 134.

⁶² Whenever the verb *iubeo* or the noun *iussum* is used in OR I, it is in reference to the pope's ability to command: OR I:36 (twice), 42, 116, 126.

⁶³ Face: OR I:40, 77, 99, 104, 121; shoulder: OR I:28, 122.

the Mass, the pope was statutorily irreplaceable in the Mass: once a priest started the celebration of Mass, no other priest could take his place.⁶⁴

The elaborate liturgical and bureaucratic structures of the papal court grew up at the same time and incorporated the same people. Both systems issued from the pope, who assigned people to specialized tasks in the administration and ritual. OR I presupposes that the ministers of the pope were required to be at festal liturgies as a sign of their membership in the papal entourage. Some of them had significant roles in the liturgy, including assisting at the altar. But even ministers with minor tasks would have considered it an extension of their offices to participate in papal ceremonial. This required participation shows that the liturgy had a broader role to play in shaping and sustaining the papal court as a whole.

The ministers of the pope were organized into compartmentalized bureaux that zealously guarded their own rights, honors, and duties.⁶⁵ The biographer of Pope Agatho (678–681) criticized the pope for having decided to act as his own *arcarius*, issuing receipts to the *nomincolator* with his own hand.⁶⁶ His overriding of the corporate lines of solidarity is said to be against custom (*ultra consuetudinem*). Only once he was laid up with illness did Agatho revert to the usual practice of having an independent *arcarius*. When the pope was not presiding over a Mass, each of the individual colleges would give Communion to fellow members; only the pope was allowed to give the Eucharist to all of the different clergy.⁶⁷ The diffuse nature of the power in the papal court was to the pope's advantage. It allowed him to be the only person who had authority over all of the disparate groups. At the same time, if his ministers were focused on competition with others in their own small body, they would be less likely to try to seize the papacy for themselves.

The clergy, both major and minor, were dominant figures in the papal courts of the seventh and eighth centuries.⁶⁸ Traditionally, there were at least three

⁶⁴ Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Legum Sectio III, Concilia aevi Karolini, ed. A. Werminghoff (Hanover, 1906–1908), i, 8–32 at 18.

⁶⁵ J. Richards, *The Popes and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages, 476–752* (London and Boston, 1979), 298–302. Cf. this feature of the imperial court in M. McCormick, “Emperor and Court,” 150–51.

⁶⁶ LP (Mommsen), 193.

⁶⁷ OR II:8 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 115).

⁶⁸ For an overview of the medieval clergy of the city of Rome, see T. di Carpegna Falconieri, *Il clero di Roma nel medioevo: Istituzioni e politica cittadina (secoli VIII–XIII)* (Rome, 2002). For a discussion of major and minor clergy in the period of my interest, there is no comprehensive history. Helpful guides include M. Andrieu, “Les ordres mineurs dans l’ancien rit romain,” *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 5 (1925), 232–74; W. Croce, “Die niederen Weihen und ihre hierarchische Wertung: Eine geschichtliche Studie,” *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 70 (1948), 257–314; B. Fischer, “Der niedere Klerus bei Gregor dem

kinds of major clergy – the bishop, priest, and deacon – and at least four kinds of minor clergy – the acolyte, exorcist, lector, and ostiary. Uncertainty reigned as to whether subdeacons were major or minor clergy until the reform papacy in the second half of the eleventh century.⁶⁹ Contradictory statements could be found among authorities; Gregory I, whose work would be instrumental in defining the major orders, implied but did not state unambiguously that subdeacons were included within the major clergy.⁷⁰ All the clergy wore the tonsure, in which all but a small circle of the man's hair was shaved off. Only the major clergy underwent the special rites of ordination, by which the pope said blessings over them, lay his hands on them, and vested them proper to their office. Members of the minor clergy could marry, and potentially even bequeath their office to their offspring.⁷¹ Marriage was not necessarily an impediment to becoming members of the major clergy in Rome, but they were supposed to remain celibate.⁷² This rule applied to subdeacons as well, because of their service at the altar.⁷³ In any case, priests and deacons were not supposed to be remarried after ordination.⁷⁴ The stages of the clerical careers of many early medieval popes have been studied.⁷⁵ This data shows that those who became pope did not necessarily have to progress through every office to advance their standing on the clerical ladder.⁷⁶

Grossen," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 62 (1938), 37–75; B. Kleinheyer, "Ordinationen und Beauftragungen," in *Sakramentliche Feiern II*, ed. B. Kleinheyer, E. von Severus, and R. Kaczynski (Regensburg, 1984), 12–65; R. Kaczynski, "Niedere Weihen," in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, ed. W. Kasper et al., 3rd edn, 11 vols (Fribourg, 1993–2001), vii, 819; Llewellyn, *Rome in the Dark Ages*, 119–20; C. Pietri, "Clercs et serviteurs laïcs de l'église romaine au temps de Grégoire le grand," in *Grégoire le grand: Chantilly, Centre culturel Les Fontaines, 15–19 septembre 1982: Actes*, ed. J. Fontaine, R. Gillet, and S. Pellistrandi (Paris, 1986), 107–22 (and reprinted in *Christiania respublica: éléments d'une enquête sur le christianisme antique*, 3 vols [Rome, 1997], i, 101–16); Schimmelpfennig, *Papsttum*, 68–9.

⁶⁹ R.E. Reynolds, "The Subdiaconate as a Sacred and Superior Order," in *Clerics in the Early Middle Ages: Hierarchy and Image* (Aldershot and Brookfield, VT, 1999), no. IV, 1–39, at 1–9.

⁷⁰ Reynolds, "Subdiaconate," 4, 6.

⁷¹ On clerical marriage, see T. di Carpegna Falconieri, "Il matrimonio e il concubinato presso il clero romano (secoli VIII–XII)," *Studi storici*, 41 (2000), 943–71, at 951–5.

⁷² Carpegna Falconieri, "Matrimonio e il concubinato," 951–5.

⁷³ Carpegna Falconieri, "Matrimonio e il concubinato," 951–2; Reynolds, "Subdiaconate," 4–6.

⁷⁴ *The Council in Trullo Revisited*, ed. G. Nedungatt and M. Featherstone (Rome, 1995), 75–6.

⁷⁵ J.M. Lungkoffler, "Die Vorstufen zu den höheren Weihen nach dem Liber Pontificalis," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 66 (1942), 1–19.

⁷⁶ J. St H. Gibaut, *The Cursus Honorum: A Study of the Origins and Evolution of Sequential Ordination* (New York, 2000), 133–8. Ordination in which a clergyman "leapt" over one of the grades was known by the Latin term *per saltum*.

One could, for instance, become a pope after only having been a deacon. The structure of the minor clergy was in flux in this period. As the Church's secular activities increased, the minor clergy became responsible for a greater number of duties in the city of Rome, and their number became far greater. At the same time, some long-standing members of the minor clergy declined in stature.

The bishops who presided over the Mass with the pope came from outside the city itself, since the pope is the bishop of Rome. The bishops took weekly turns celebrating Mass within the city, which is why they were called *hebdomadarii*⁷⁷ from the Latin *hebdomada* (week).⁷⁸ Though OR I does not state it explicitly, this duty was fulfilled by the seven suburbicarian bishops, who served in the ancient sees around the city of Rome: Ostia, Porto, Silva Candida, Albano, Velletri, Palestrina (ancient Praeneste), and Gabii.⁷⁹ The bishops of Ostia, Albano, and Porto were particularly significant because they jointly took part in the ceremony to ordain a new pope.⁸⁰ These bishops are the ancestors of the "cardinal" bishops and priests: they were given special permission by the pope to serve in a church besides the one to which they were assigned at their ordination, or "incardinated."⁸¹ This was a necessity in Rome because of the patriarchal basilicas, which did not have a body of clergy ordained to serve in them. Nowhere in OR I is the term *cardinalis* employed, and its absence in a document so sensitive to titulature implies that it was not yet in common, accepted usage among the upper reaches of the Roman Church. The first certain attestation of this adjective occurs in the mid-eighth century.⁸² Only gradually would it become an honorific detached from its initial technical meaning.

⁷⁷ Cf. LP (Duchesne), i, 478, 484 n. 56.

⁷⁸ A. Chavasse, "Les *episcopi* dans la liturgie de l'Urbs, au VII^e au VIII^e siècle," in *La liturgie de la ville de Rome du V^e au VIII^e siècle: une liturgie conditionnée par l'organisation de la vie in Urbe et Extra Muros* (Rome, 1993), 337–42, at 339.

⁷⁹ Noble, *Republic*, 215; R.E. Reynolds, "The Organisation, Law and Liturgy of the Western Church, 700–900," in *The New Cambridge Medieval History. Volume 2, c.700–c.900*, ed. R. McKitterick (Cambridge and New York, 1995), 587–621, at 609.

⁸⁰ *Liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum*, ed. H. Foerster (Bern, 1958), 111 (V57) = 209 (C56) = 315–16 (A51). Cf. OR XLA (*Les Ordines Romani*, v, 297).

⁸¹ S. Kuttner, "Cardinalis: The History of a Canonical Concept," *Traditio*, 3 (1945), 129–214. This article was reprinted in *The History of Ideas and Doctrine of Canon Law in the Middle Ages* (London, 1980), no. X, with Kuttner's *retractiones* in the back of the volume, 14–19; M. Andrieu, "L'origine du titre de Cardinal dans l'Eglise Romaine," in *Miscellanea G. Mercati*, Studi e testi, 121 (Vatican City, 1946), v, 113–44, independently arrived at some of the same conclusions. Kuttner's theory is still to be preferred over C.G. Fürst, *Cardinalis: Prolegomena zu einer Rechtsgeschichte des römischen Kardinalskollegiums* (Munich, 1967).

⁸² Kuttner, "Cardinalis," 146.

The priests in OR I were from the city of Rome and were called upon to serve in the papal liturgy, just as they were assigned weekly turns (*ebdomadas*) performing baptisms and penance at patriarchal basilicas.⁸³ These duties were in addition to performing pastoral duties like celebrating Mass and carrying out baptisms, penance, and burials at their own titular churches, one of Rome's 25 or so parish churches.⁸⁴ Since most of the patriarchal basilicas participating in the liturgy of Easter Week did not have priests attached to them for normal pastoral care (the *cura animarum*), priests were chosen to travel to them to assist the pope. When a station was held at a titular church that had its own priests, these priests would participate in the papal liturgy as well.⁸⁵

The head of the priests and oldest priest in the city of Rome was the archpriest.⁸⁶ His most important function was serving as a member of the three-person council that ruled Rome during a papal interregnum (a *sedes vacans*).⁸⁷ One scholar has characterized the Roman clergy as a "gerontocracy."⁸⁸ To be ordained a priest canonically, one had to achieve 30 years of age; to be a deacon, one had to be 25 years old.⁸⁹ The relative precedence of priests as well as deacons was based upon seniority of years since ordination.⁹⁰ Though difficult to discern in many documents, a concern with age becomes more apparent upon examining signatory lists for councils from comparable late antique sees like those in Gaul⁹¹ or those from eighth-century Roman councils.⁹² The biography of Pope Conon (686–687) demonstrates the preference in the Roman clergy for seniority. The battle for the papacy was initially between the archpriest and the second most senior priest.⁹³ Conon was a compromise candidate chosen when there was a

⁸³ Cf. LP (Geertman), 218.

⁸⁴ Llewellyn, *Rome in the Dark Ages*, 121; Reynolds, "Organisation," 609.

⁸⁵ OR I:26.

⁸⁶ Schimmelpfennig, *Papsttum*, 68.

⁸⁷ *Liber diurnus*, 113–14 (V59) = 211 (C58) = 318–20 (A53); 117–19 (V61) = 215–17 (C60) = 326–8 (A55); 119–20 (V62) = 217–18 (C61) = 328 (A56); 120–21 (V63) = 218–19 (C62) = 329–31 (A57).

⁸⁸ Richards, *Popes and the Papacy*, 290.

⁸⁹ *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 87–8.

⁹⁰ A. Amanieu, "Archiprêtre," in *Dictionnaire de droit canonique*, ed. R. Naz, 7 vols (Paris, 1935–1965), i, 1004–26, at 1004; T. F. X. Noble, "The Papacy in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries," in *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Volume 2*, 563–86, at 575; Reynolds, "Organisation," 612.

⁹¹ R. Mathisen, *Ecclesiastical Factionalism and Religious Controversy in Fifth-Century Gaul* (Washington, DC, 1989), 279–91.

⁹² Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, ii, 790–93; M. McCormick, "Textes, images et iconoclasme dans le cadre des relations entre Byzance et l'Occident carolingien," in *Testo e immagine nell'alto medioevo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, 41, 2 vols (Spoleto, 1994), i, 95–162, at 133–4 n. 78.

⁹³ LP (Mommsen), 207: "... in sequentem eius Theodorum presbiterum."

deadlock over the other two candidates. Despite the fact that Conon was only the third oldest priest in the city,⁹⁴ his biographer praised him for his advanced age (*provecta etas*), since his legitimacy as pope was partially dependent upon his age.

The most important ministers in the city were the seven deacons⁹⁵ – one for each ecclesiastical region – and their assistants, the 14 subdeacons. They were jointly charged to administer ecclesiastical personnel and property, and distribute charity to the poor.⁹⁶ Since at least the fourth century, the deacons had assumed positions of great authority in the city of Rome.⁹⁷ One of the subdeacons had a specialized title and task to fulfill in the liturgy of OR I: the *oblationarius* subdeacon was responsible for handing over the pope's bread and wine during the offertory.⁹⁸

The archdeacon was the head of the deacons, and pope's assistant in administration of the clergy and city.⁹⁹ He fulfilled several important liturgical functions, including holding up the chalice during the elevation.¹⁰⁰ The *Liber pontificalis* tells of two separate occasions in which the archdeacon almost became pope: Paschal before Sergius I's reign (687–701)¹⁰¹ and Theophylact before Paul's reign (757–767).¹⁰² The formularies from the *Liber diurnus* provide us with an even better measure of this official's power in the seventh and eighth centuries. The archdeacon was responsible for sending out letters on the correct dating of Easter, and his title was the most exalted one on this subscription list.¹⁰³ In the papal consecration ceremony, he was the one to vest the pope with the pallium,¹⁰⁴ the band of white wool that only the pope and those to whom he granted it were allowed to wear. During papal interregna, the archdeacon was

⁹⁴ LP (Mommsen), 207: "... denominaverunt tertiam personam supra fati pontificis." Although the biography does not explicitly say Conon was a priest, this is the most plausible interpretation of the evidence. Within the city of Rome, the archpriest was the highest ranking cleric under the pope, followed by the second priest, the third priest, and so on.

⁹⁵ The number of deacons in a city is traditionally limited to seven in accordance with Acts 6:1–6. For a contemporary reference to this long-standing norm, see *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 88–92.

⁹⁶ Noble, *Republic*, 217–18; Reynolds, "Organisation," 609–10; Richards, *Popes and the Papacy*, 293–4; Saxer, "Chiesa di Roma," 523–4.

⁹⁷ F. Prat, "Les prétensions des diacres romains au quatrième siècle," *Recherches de science religieuse*, 3 (1912), 463–75.

⁹⁸ OR I:79, 83.

⁹⁹ M. Groten, "Archidiakon," in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, i, 947–8.

¹⁰⁰ OR I:89.

¹⁰¹ LP (Mommsen), 210–11.

¹⁰² LP (Duchesne), i, 463.

¹⁰³ *Liber diurnus*, 81–2 (V7) = 184 (C7).

¹⁰⁴ *Liber diurnus*, 111 (V57) = 209 (C56) = 315–16 (A51).

one member of a three-person council that ruled the city.¹⁰⁵ Formularies from the *Liber diurnus* make it clear that at least one archdeacon was in fact elected pontiff, although it does not specify which pope.¹⁰⁶ There may have been more than one, but the offices of the popes before their election to the papacy are not all known. The archdeacon would have been an ideal candidate for pope: He was intimately familiar with the workings of the Lateran bureaucracy, and he had a powerful position during the interregnum. Gregory I's story of an ambitious archdeacon who attempted to poison his bishop in order to wrest the see for himself must have been based on a familiar type.¹⁰⁷ The power of the Roman archdeacon was well known to the anonymous monk of Whitby who wrote the earliest life of Gregory: it was the archdeacon who dealt with Anglo-Saxon emissaries who had opened a box of relics from the pope intended for their master.¹⁰⁸

Acolytes were clerical attendants, responsible for assisting other ministers in the liturgy.¹⁰⁹ They did not, however, have the same administrative or societal significance as the deacons or subdeacons. One acolyte had a specialized title and liturgical function: the *stationarius* carried chrism in a flask (*ampulla*) and saw to it that the other acolytes carried items with them.¹¹⁰ Certain acolytes were assigned special tasks to fulfill in the course of the Mass. Some of the acolytes delivered the *fermentum*, the consecrated bread of the pope, to the titular churches.¹¹¹ At least two acolytes guarded the gate to the presbytery.¹¹² The acolyte referred to as being "at the shoulder" (*sub humero*) of the pope was prepared to provide water for the ritual washing of hands.¹¹³

A careful reading shows that OR I is not intended to order the entire Roman clergy. The writers of the document did not focus on the ranking of the major clergy like bishops and priests, but instead is particularly concerned with the position of certain less-exalted clergy. Some clerics with lower grades,

¹⁰⁵ *Liber diurnus*, 113–14 (V59) = 211 (C58) = 318–20 (A53); 117–19 (V61) = 215–17 (C60) = 326–8 (A55); 119–20 (V62) = 217–18 (C61) = 328 (A56); 120–21 (V63) = 218–19 (C62) = 329–31 (A57).

¹⁰⁶ *Liber diurnus*, 111–13 (V58) = 209–11 (C57) = 316–18 (A52); 120–21 (V63) = 218–19 (C62) = 329–31 (A57). On these formularies, see L. Duchesne, "Le *Liber Diurnus* et les élections pontificales au VII^e siècle," *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des chartes*, 52 (1891), 5–30.

¹⁰⁷ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, ed. A. de Vogüé, trans. P. Antin, Sources chrétiennes, 251, 260, 265 (Paris, 1978–1980), ii, 274, 276.

¹⁰⁸ *Earliest Life*, 108.

¹⁰⁹ B. Kleinheyser, "Akolyth," in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, i, 293.

¹¹⁰ OR I:11.

¹¹¹ OR I:19, 101–2. Cf. OR I:11.

¹¹² OR I:126.

¹¹³ OR I:28, 91.

like the *primicerius* of the notaries and the attendant subdeacons, appear more frequently than bishops and priests.¹¹⁴ This suggests that while the entire clergy might have received prestige from the liturgy, and they were all incorporated into an order of precedence, the position of the minor clergy was more important for this document. This would also explain why the *primicerius* of the notaries, *secundicerius*, and *primicerius* of the *defensores* were given the special honor of offering their gifts to the pope in front of the *confessio*, which held the primary relics of the church.¹¹⁵ Most likely there was no consensus as to where these officials stood within the papal court and liturgy was meant to consolidate their position. In three of the five examples of the *sustentatio*, the *primicerius* of the notaries holds the pope's right hand, suggesting that the pope is interested in exalting this minister's position. This is especially clear when comparing the information from OR I with an undated formulary from the *Liber diurnus*, in which the *primicerius* of the notaries ranked below regional subdeacons.¹¹⁶

Not all ministers received the same elaboration. The majority of papal ministers listed in OR I appear in five chapters or fewer.¹¹⁷ Most of these officers only had minor functions, and may not have been strictly necessary for the functioning of the liturgy. This suggests that the designer of the liturgy was attempting to find some kind of function for a large body of ministers, because it was imperative that they had *some* place in the ceremonial. To leave them out would be an insult.

The topics under discussion here have been hierarchy, social status, and politics. Perhaps this seems surprising – after all, is OR I not a liturgical document? As I hope to have shown, setting off liturgical documents as *sui generis* and unhistorical is an artificial dichotomy. Nor do liturgical texts innocently reflect the times that produced them: at times they were composed to actively shape societies.¹¹⁸ As with many other ritual documents, OR I was likely intended to establish a hierarchical system. Similar documents either order people in a time of stress or reinforce an already existing system.¹¹⁹ Ritual

¹¹⁴ The *primicerius* of the notaries and the attendant subdeacons are mentioned 13 times in OR I, whereas bishops are mentioned 11 times and priests 10 times.

¹¹⁵ ORI:74.

¹¹⁶ *Liber diurnus*, 69 (V3)=182–3 (C3).

¹¹⁷ This includes the second deacon, regional *defensores*, regional notaries, the *nominolator*, the *defensores*, the first bishop, the *vicedominus*, the *vesterarius*, the notaries, and the archpriest.

¹¹⁸ Cf. C. Bell, "Ritualization of Texts and Textualization of Ritual in the Codification of Taoist Liturgy," *History of Religions*, 27 (1988), 366–92; F.H. Gorman, *The Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time and Status in the Priestly Theology* (Sheffield, 1990).

¹¹⁹ G. Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale: Symbolik und Herrschaft im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 2003), 9–31; L. Richard Della Fave, "Ritual and the Legitimation of Inequality," *Sociological Perspectives*, 34 (1991), 21–38.

in tribal societies is often used to confer offices, legitimize and sustain people's positions, and create new status.¹²⁰ OR I is designed to forge or bolster a hierarchical order, with the pope at the helm¹²¹ and a series of ministers serving him. The pope's ministers can best be described as a service hierarchy, in which the participants carry out functions on behalf of the pope, but these are reckoned as honors and not servitude.¹²² This explanation makes the almost constant references to the order of ministers in OR I comprehensible. Since details about the relationships among ministers recur with such great frequency, it appears likely that this information is at the heart of OR I, rather than a supplementary feature. OR I was, of course, only one of many papal liturgies, and the shapers of public worship knew they did not have to accomplish all their aims with the ceremony described in OR I. The repetitive cycle of liturgical celebrations that the members of the papal court would be required to attend created an opportunity greater than any one liturgy could achieve.

The few written records of papal liturgies preserved point to a broader truth: the clergy of Rome in the seventh and eighth centuries was extremely concerned with the issue of precedence, hierarchy, and special rights that came from their status. They jostled to increase their own standing, competed for honors, and defended their rights against those they deemed unworthy. A letter of Gregory I reveals that it was a special honor to receive Communion among the clergy.¹²³ A Biblical commentary makes clear that certain prayers were reserved for priests alone.¹²⁴

The biographers of the popes in the *Liber pontificalis* were sensitive to issues of rank and privilege. Deusdedit (615–618) was said to have been loved by the clergy specifically because he restored the priests and other clergy to their original positions.¹²⁵ This most likely means that he demoted the monks favored by Gregory I and promoted members of the clergy in their place.¹²⁶ Boniface V (619–625) made two adjustments to limit the roles of certain ranks of clergy, stripping acolytes of the ability to lift relics and giving attendant subdeacons

¹²⁰ M. Fortes, "Ritual and Office in Tribal Society," in *Politics, Law and Ritual in Tribal Society*, ed. M. Gluckman (Chicago, 1965), 53–88.

¹²¹ Brown, *Gentlemen and Officers*, 185–6; Richards, *Consul*, 121; H.A.J. Wegman, *Liturgie in der Geschichte des Christentums* (Regensburg, 1994), 230.

¹²² Althoff, *Macht*, 93–7. Serving the emperor was seen as the highest achievable status in Byzantium: Kazhdan and Constable, *People and Power*, 35.

¹²³ Gregory I, *Registrum*, i, 270. A priest who had been excommunicated was allowed to receive among laymen, but no longer with the clergy.

¹²⁴ *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian*, ed. B. Bischoff and M. Lapidge (Cambridge, 1994), 374–5.

¹²⁵ LP (Mommsen), 166.

¹²⁶ LP (Duchesne), i, 319 n. 1.

(but not acolytes) permission to baptize with a deacon at the Lateran.¹²⁷ When the patriarch of Constantinople, Pyrrhus, visited Rome during the reign of Theodore (642–649), he was allowed to distribute gifts to the populace and sit in a chair (*cathedra*) near the altar, both of which, according to the *Liber pontificalis*, honored him like the bishops and priests (*sacerdotes*) of the imperial city.¹²⁸ One of the most remarkable signs of Adeodatus' (672–676) kindness was that he received every man, from greatest to least.¹²⁹ Although the exact meaning of the brief reference is unclear, Donus (676–678) is remembered as having increased the honors of the clergy.¹³⁰ Agatho (678–681) is criticized for honoring some members of the clergy beyond what was appropriate in the opinion of his biographer.¹³¹ Benedict II (684–685) was commemorated as having bestowed honors on different orders in the Church.¹³² The biographer of Conon (686–687), along with other Roman clergy, was incensed that the pope allowed a non-Roman deacon, Constantine of Syracuse, to use the official papal saddle-cloth (*mappula*).¹³³

A final example from outside the city of Rome reinforces the point. At the Council in Trullo, priests and deacons who had uncanonically married a second time after having been ordained were given a choice: either to give up their wives or their seating privileges!¹³⁴ It is hard to avoid the conclusion that part of the basic sense of identity of members of the papal court was their relative status and the rights that flowed therefrom.

The Laity in Papal Liturgy

This discussion has primarily been focused on the clergy, for whom OR I was composed and used. As a whole, the centers of power in Roman society became more clerical in the early Middle Ages. The administration of the city was concentrated in the papal court and joining it could contribute to one's career advancement; it is likely in some cases that the lives of the clergy were similar

¹²⁷ LP (Mommsen), 168.

¹²⁸ LP (Mommsen), 179. For this term, *The Book of Pontiffs* (*Liber Pontificalis*): *The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715*, ed. and trans. R. Davis, Translated Texts for Historians, 6, 2nd edn (Liverpool, 2000), 136.

¹²⁹ LP (Mommsen), 190.

¹³⁰ LP (Mommsen), 192. The precise wording ("Clerum videlicet diversis ordinibus honoribus ampliavit") raises the possibility that Donus changed the order of precedence to some extent, raising the status of some of the clergy.

¹³¹ LP (Mommsen), 193.

¹³² LP (Mommsen), 203.

¹³³ LP (Mommsen), 208.

¹³⁴ *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 71–2.

to those of lay nobles.¹³⁵ It is challenging to establish how the clergy related to the laity of the city of Rome. One would expect to see evidence of a complex, if not contentious, relationship between the clergy and laity, at liturgies or otherwise. Yet the main source for papal liturgies, *ordines*, typically provides little information on those in attendance at liturgies.¹³⁶ Even when they do, one should not automatically assume that they show the full spectrum of people in a given society. Ritual guides to processions are not always literal microcosms of the society in which they were held: they tend to omit some members of society and exaggerate others.¹³⁷ The clergy is understandably prominent in processions organized by one of their own body. All that said, OR I nevertheless gives us some important hints on the presence and status of the laity in contemporary Rome, although it is entirely confined to the permanent residents of the city. Pilgrims were an important economic and social presence in Rome starting in Late Antiquity and extending throughout the Middle Ages.¹³⁸ Richard Krautheimer has estimated that medieval pilgrimage to Rome reached its height in the sixth and seventh centuries.¹³⁹ Seventh-century Roman guidebooks facilitated pious tourism to various sites.¹⁴⁰ Flasks (*ampullae*) in the form of seashells found in the excavation at Crypta Balbi were likely sold to pilgrims.¹⁴¹ It is likely that pilgrims were one of the audiences that the grand processions of OR I were calibrated to impress.¹⁴² Yet OR I, like most *ordines*, focused on citizens of Rome when it did recognize the laity. One has to look at a late-eighth-century *ordo* to find at last a reference to a large crowd of pilgrims at one celebration.¹⁴³

¹³⁵ F. Marazzi, "Aristocrazia e società (secoli VI–XI)," in *Roma medievale*, ed. A. Vauchez (Rome, 2001), 41–69.

¹³⁶ Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 102–3.

¹³⁷ R. Darnton, *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History* (New York, 1984), 119–24.

¹³⁸ D.J. Birch, *Pilgrimage to Rome in the Middle Ages: Continuity and Change* (Woodbridge, Suffolk; Rochester, NY, 1998); V. Saxer, "Pilgerwesen in Italien und Rom im späten Altertum und Frühmittelalter," in *Akten des XII. internationalen Kongresses für christliche Archäologie, Bonn 1991*, 2 vols (Münster, 1995), i, 36–57.

¹³⁹ R. Krautheimer, *Rome: Profile of a City, 312–1308*, foreword by M. Trachtenberg (Princeton, 2000 [1980]), 83.

¹⁴⁰ G.B. De Rossi, *La Roma sotterranea cristiana* (Rome, 1864), 128–57; *Codice topografico della città di Roma*, ed. R. Valentini and G. Zucchetti, *Fonti per la storia d'Italia*, pub. dal R. Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo, Scrittori, Secoli IV–XII (Rome, 1942), ii, 29–47.

¹⁴¹ *Roma dall'antichità al medioevo: Archeologia e storia nel Museo nazionale romano*, ed. M.S. Arena, P. Delogu, L. Paroli, M. Ricci, L. Saguì, and L. Vendittelli (Milan, 2001), 475–6.

¹⁴² I learned this point from a personal conversation with Paolo Delogu.

¹⁴³ OR XV:79 (*Les Ordines Romani*, iii, 113). On the *ordo*, see *Les Ordines Romani*, iii, 59–92 and Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 152–4, 168. Although this *ordo* is a combination

At least some signs point to the superiority the clergy felt over the laity. Gregory I criticized members of the clergy for scorning the laity as sinners.¹⁴⁴ There were different prayers to honor certain members of the clergy and the laity, and the prayer containing the names of the clergy was announced before those of the laity.¹⁴⁵ Although both the clergy and the laity provided gifts for the sacrifice, a different term was used for the offerings of the two groups: *oblata* for the clergy and *oblaciones* for the faithful.¹⁴⁶ The clergy was careful to distinguish between the two in the course of the Mass, reserving the clerical offerings for their own members and giving the laity their own offerings after consecration.¹⁴⁷

The author of OR I uses the rather anonymous *populus* seven times to refer to any one of the groups of Roman laity.¹⁴⁸ From other papal documents it is evident that, like clerical culture, there was a refined order to lay society, both in the titles assigned to people and the order of precedence within it.¹⁴⁹ Late Roman models of hierarchy continued to create status distinctions throughout Italy.¹⁵⁰ Some of the distinctions among people can be discerned through the threefold grouping of those present in church. This is not said explicitly, but it can be inferred from the directions for distributing Communion in ORI:113–16, 18.¹⁵¹ The most elite among the population is given consecrated bread by the pope and consecrated wine by the archdeacon; the bishops give consecrated bread to the next group of people and the deacons give them the consecrated wine; and the last group of people receives consecrated bread and wine from priests. Each distinct societal group was assigned a distinct set of ministers to serve it. The highest section on the right side of the pope's chair was reserved for men and known as the *senatorium*. Although the Roman Senate itself had disappeared

of Roman and Frankish elements, the accurate distinction among different groups in Rome (clergy, monks, and suburban residents) makes this likely to be a Roman element.

¹⁴⁴ Gregory I, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, ed. R. Etaix, CCL, 141 (Turnhout, 1999), 289–90 (sermon 33).

¹⁴⁵ *L'ordinaire*, 74, 76 (*Te igitur*, for the clergy); 76 (*Memento*, for the laity).

¹⁴⁶ Cf. *oblata*: ORI:74, 78, 82, 83, 84 (sing.), 90, 97 (sing.); *oblaciones*: ORI:69, 71, 72 (twice), 90 (twice), 97, 101, 105. See also OR XI:32, 74 in *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 425, 441. For discussion of these terms, see Ellebracht, *Remarks*, 80–83.

¹⁴⁷ The offerings of the laity were placed in the paten (ORI:97) and then distributed to the faithful (ORI: 113–18) or sent out to titular churches (ORI:101–2), whereas the clerical offerings were left on the altar (ORI:97) and then given to bishops and priests (ORI:109–10). The clergy might have had different bread stamps than the laity.

¹⁴⁸ ORI:96, 111, 114, 116, 117, 121, 124.

¹⁴⁹ See, for example, the biography of Pope Stephen III (768–772) in LP (Duchesne), i, 471, which lists groups of Romans gathered: “optimates militiae atque universum exercitum et cives honestos, omnisque populi Romani coetum, a magno usque ad parvum.”

¹⁵⁰ Brown, *Gentlemen and Officers*, 126–43.

¹⁵¹ Cf. P. Batiffol, *Leçons sur la messe*, 4th edn (Paris, 1919), 296.

by the latest in the seventh century,¹⁵² this name, with its associations of a much earlier stage of the Roman Empire, persisted. Rather than the defunct title *senatores*, the men who sat in this section were called *principes*,¹⁵³ a name that conjures their leading role in society. Like the finely gradated patterns of precedence among clergy, a similar order existed among the leading men in the society. In OR I:69, the pope receives the offerings of the *principes* in order of their *archium*. This word is a Latinized genitive plural of the Greek *archē*. The term is more specific than “authorities” of some kind.¹⁵⁴ Instead, it refers to those holding office (*archai*), and, by extension, the dignity received from the offices.¹⁵⁵ In other words, much as in Constantinople and Byzantine provincial society, the *principes* carried out their part in the liturgy in an order of precedence defined by their dignity.¹⁵⁶ In this way, the importance of those who partook in the ceremony would be recognized by everyone at the Mass, as that participation concretized their mutual relationships of rank.

This solitary example also testifies to the fact that the author of OR I and the clergy who participated in the Mass had to be able to recognize civil and military dignities in their interactions with the laity. Because the emperor would have conferred such dignities, it shows the role that the imperial court still had on

¹⁵² F. Burgarella, “Il Senato,” in *Roma nell’alto medioevo*, i, 121–78, at 171–2. Honorius I (625–638) converted the curia where the senate would meet into a church dedicated to St Hadrian.

¹⁵³ This is the name that OR I explicitly gives to those in this section. It is possible, as E. De Benedictis contended (“The Senatorium and Matroneum in the Early Roman Church,” *Rivista di archeologia cristiana*, 57 (1981), 69–85, at 71; and *eadem*, “The ‘Schola Cantorum’ in Rome during the High Middle Ages” [Bryn Mawr College, 1983], 12) that those who sat there were still referred to by the now honorific title *senator*, but there is no documentary evidence to support this supposition, and I agree with Llewellyn, *Rome in the Dark Ages*, 140, that the title *senator* itself had disappeared by this point. Though not impossible, I find it unlikely that the *principes* referred to in OR I:69 are in fact the reigning emperor and empress, and Roman nobles were offering gifts on their behalf (Llewellyn, “The Roman Church,” 379 with n. 3). Contemporary references show that there was no necessary connection between the term and the imperial rulers: It generally refers to the leading men or those with political power. Cf. LP (Mommsen), 203, 207; and LP (Duchesne), i, 396, 402, 405, 417, 432, 433.

¹⁵⁴ *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 91; Brown, *Gentlemen and Officers*, 24, 186.

¹⁵⁵ Stein, “Période byzantine,” 155 n. 23. The term corresponds most closely to Lampe’s definition IIC, “those holding office...magistrates,” or IID, “orders of ministry” (though here specifically with reference to an ecclesiastical context). See G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1968), 236.

¹⁵⁶ For a comparable case of forms of imperial precedence being transferred to provincial society, see M. McCormick’s analysis of the ninth-century Plea of Rižana (located south of Trieste), “The Imperial Edge: Italo-Byzantine Identity, Movement and Integration, A.D. 650–950,” in *Studies of the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire*, ed. H. Ahrweiler and A.E. Laiou (Washington, DC, 1998), 17–52, at 47–51.

the formation of orders of precedence in distant provincial society. The pages of *Liber pontificalis* biographies of the seventh to mid-eighth centuries frequently list titles and dignities that had no place in the Roman clergy or, in some cases, the city of Rome.¹⁵⁷ They mainly came from the imperial court, though some were from the new Barbarian kingdoms that had arisen in Western Europe. By recognizing the titles, the members of the papal court in effect recognized that secular ranks granted by distant emperors and kings and held by their ministers were authoritative.¹⁵⁸ The late Roman sensitivity to precise titles and precedence was not just a preserve of the clergy of the city of Rome.

Women play a distinct but minor part in the course of action described in ORI. As with men, there was a threefold separation of the women in attendance at the papal Mass. The section for noblewomen was called the *pars* or *partes mulierum*.¹⁵⁹ At first glance, women seem to have no meaningful role in this liturgy. Although elsewhere in Western Europe women had greater liturgical responsibilities, there had been a long-standing tendency to distance women from any service at the altar in Rome.¹⁶⁰ Women sat on the left side of churches,¹⁶¹ a side that had negative connotations. Having women sit on the less honorable side would be a tenacious norm in Western European churches, although what was considered the right and left sides would change.¹⁶² In both the Mass and baptismal liturgy, the clergy always ministered to men before women.¹⁶³ One might refer to the hierarchical organization of those at the Mass as a typically male form of social ordering, as women tend not to order relationships in such

¹⁵⁷ The titles of those not in the Roman clergy are omnipresent in *Liber pontificalis*. For a few recurrent examples, see *dux* in LP (Mommsen), 217; LP (Duchesne), i, 398, 400, 403, 405, 417, 428, 431, 445, 447, 454; *exarchus* in LP (Mommsen), 161, 166, 168, 175, 179, 183, 217, 224; LP (Duchesne), i, 403, 404, 406, 408, 417, 430; *imperator* in LP (Mommsen), 176, 222; LP (Duchesne), i, 398, 405, 409, 415, 463; *patriarcha* in LP (Mommsen), 179, 180, 182, 185, 195, 196, 197; LP (Duchesne), i, 409; *patricius* in LP (Mommsen), 166; 168, 175, 176, 178, 182, 217, 222, 224; LP (Duchesne), i, 403, 404, 417; *rex* in LP (Duchesne), i, 407, 426, 429, 430, 431, 433, 434, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. M. McCormick, "Emperor and Court," 157.

¹⁵⁹ ORI:113-16, 118.

¹⁶⁰ G. Macy, *The Hidden History of Women's Ordination: Female Clergy in the Medieval West* (Oxford and New York, 2008), esp. 61-2.

¹⁶¹ ORI:115; ORI:XI:2, 83 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 418, 443).

¹⁶² I. Müller, "Frauen rechts, Männer links: Historische Platzverteilung in der Kirche," *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde*, 57 (1961), 65-81.

¹⁶³ In the Mass, with the collection of the offerings (ORI:69, 74) and the distribution of Communion (ORI:117-18). For baptism, see ORI:XI:2, 4, 12-15, 18-19, 24-5 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 418, 420-21, 422, 423-4).

a strictly gradated fashion.¹⁶⁴ There were no women who served in papal liturgy. Deaconesses appear in Italian sources for the first time in the seventh and eighth centuries, but they did not serve at the altar.¹⁶⁵ Other deaconesses appear to have led monastic or semi-monastic existences in Rome; they did not undertake any liturgical service.

Male clergy monopolized all of the significant liturgical functions in papal Rome, which calls to mind the theory Nancy Jay established through comparative anthropology about sacrifice.¹⁶⁶ She argued that sacrifice establishes intergenerational bonds among men that deliberately exclude women. In her view, the sacrifice of the Mass is one of the prime examples of this tendency. While marginalized in the papal liturgy, women still do maintain some role in this ceremony. Women were part of the noble families who donated to churches. Women could have been among those petitioning the pope on his path to the church.¹⁶⁷ More significantly, women would have prepared and presented bread for the Eucharist (*oblata*) to the pope, which were later used in the Mass.¹⁶⁸ This function was a liturgical act, a contribution to the sacrifice of the Mass.¹⁶⁹ Women, too, received Communion from the ministers, including women in the *pars mulierum* who received it from the pope himself.¹⁷⁰ Since giving offerings and taking Communion were phased out in the course of the development of medieval liturgy, one might speak of a more extensive role for women in the liturgy of OR I than in later medieval liturgy.

Although lay men and women had their part to play in the papal liturgy, there could be little doubt that in the realm of worship the clergy were dominant. The easiest way to recognize this is by viewing the veneration of the cross during Holy Week, the week leading up to Easter, in Rome and Constantinople.¹⁷¹ In the imperial city, the order of veneration was the emperor and the army, followed by the empress and her entourage, and finally the patriarch and his

¹⁶⁴ C. Gilligan, *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, MA, 1993), 32–3, 48–9, 57, 62–3, 101, 126, 166, 173.

¹⁶⁵ A.G. Martimort, *Les diaconesses: Essai historique* (Rome, 1982), 201–5.

¹⁶⁶ N. Jay, *Throughout your Generations Forever: Sacrifice, Religion, and Paternity* (Chicago, 1992), 112–27.

¹⁶⁷ OR I:12–14.

¹⁶⁸ OR I:74.

¹⁶⁹ A. Angenendt, "Missa specialis: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Entstehung der Privatmessen," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 17 (1983), 153–221, at 175–80, 195–202; and reprinted in *Liturgie im Mittelalter: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. T. Flammer and D. Meyer (Münster, 2004), 111–90, at 137–43, 160–69.

¹⁷⁰ OR I:118.

¹⁷¹ For Rome, see OR XXIII:14–16 (*Les Ordines Romani*, iii, 271); and for Constantinople, see Adomnan, *De locis sanctis*, in *Itineraria et alia geographica*, CCSL, 175–6 (Turnhout, 1965), 177–234, at 228–9.

clergy. In contrast, the clergy in Rome were first rather than last. Not only were women last in Rome, but, unlike the men, they had to depend upon the clergy to bring the relic of the cross to them. The fear may have been that otherwise women would approach too close to the presbytery and the altar, polluting it by their presence.¹⁷²

Scholars have often emphasized the prominence of Greek monks and Greek culture in general in early medieval Rome and, specifically, in the papal court.¹⁷³ Yet not until the last chapter of OR I is there any reference to monks at all. OR I:126 does not specify that these were Greek monks, or from which monastery they originated, simply providing the generic *monachi* (monks). The monks' role in the liturgy is a relatively limited one at the end of the ceremony, and the monks walk after the major and minor clergy. This low ranking is confirmed by a feature of the precedence described in *Liber pontificalis*. If a monk is simultaneously a monk and a priest, he is ranked according to his monastic, not his priestly, status.¹⁷⁴ This suggests that there was a prejudice among the Roman clergy towards monks even if they were also members of the clergy, and provides a precious hint at the internal and institutional tensions within the ecclesiastical population of Rome in this period. Monks staked out for themselves a relatively elevated position in the papal household during the time of Gregory I and some of his successors.¹⁷⁵ Gregory I was particularly anxious to preserve the independent rights of monks, forbidding, for instance, bishops from celebrating public Mass in monasteries.¹⁷⁶ Yet it is evident that the religious no longer held sway as the papal court developed. Clerics, not clergy leading semi-monastic lives like Gregory I, were in control of the papal court. Gregory I's promotion of monks was the reason that his popularity in Rome was extremely low after his pontificate, and why his cult grew mainly outside of Rome due to his successful missionary efforts.¹⁷⁷ It is apparent that monks were safely minimized in papal ceremonial. This in turn should occasion some circumspection about claims that the monks were power brokers in seventh- and eighth-century Rome. Women

¹⁷² S.F. Wemple, *Women in Frankish Society: Marriage and the Cloister* (Philadelphia, 1981), 139–43.

¹⁷³ J.M. Sansterre, *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne (milieu du VIe s. – fin du IXe s.)*, 2 vols (Brussels, 1993), esp. i, 115–46; Krautheimer, *Rome*, 89–108.

¹⁷⁴ See the biography of Pope Agatho (678–681) in LP (Mommsen), 198, in which those who are priests and monks are listed below deacons; and the life of Pope Constantine (708–715) in LP (Mommsen), 223, in which an abbot and priest is listed below a deacon and an *arcarius*.

¹⁷⁵ Richards, *Popes and the Papacy*, 170, 177, 179, 216–18, 256–68; Schimmelpfennig, *Papsttum*, 69.

¹⁷⁶ For the Roman Council of 601, see PL, lxxvii, 1340D–1343D, at 1342A–B.

¹⁷⁷ Llewellyn, “Roman Church.”

and monks may in particular suffer from the style of procession in OR I – that is, a cortège rather than a popular procession.¹⁷⁸ In the latter, the different sectors of Roman society would be involved. The prime example of this kind is the famous sevenfold liturgy developed by Gregory I to ward off the plague.¹⁷⁹ The version from Gregory includes monks, nuns, married women, widows, the poor, and children; Gregory of Tours' version – based on a trusted eyewitness report – includes abbots with their monks, abbesses with their nuns, children, the laity, widows, and married women.¹⁸⁰ Sergius I instituted new Marian litanies in which the laity participated.¹⁸¹ These may have given the citizens of Rome some form of procession in which they had a more active role than in the papal cortège featured in OR I.

Tensions under the Surface

Ritual documents like OR I do a better job of telling us how a system should work than how it actually did. Is it possible to evaluate how well such a system might have played out? The natural resources of the liturgy could cement someone's authority, a trend that is attested elsewhere.¹⁸² The liturgy was particularly effective since it did not require a conscious submission to the pope. Rather, those who participated or attended a papal procession and Mass were tacitly confirming the pope's growing power and reordering of the clergy. As long as everyone submitted to the form of the ceremony, they confirmed the orders set by the liturgy through their passive presence. When ceremony is well orchestrated, it can create new realities, all the while making them appear as if they are the objective way that the world is now and always has been.¹⁸³ The liturgy would make it seem that the position of the pope and his ministers was something perpetual and divinely ordained rather than newly fashioned by an ascendant papacy. The papal liturgies that carefully ordered the entourage of the pope helped to make this order standard – the ministers became accustomed

¹⁷⁸ Baldovin, *Urban Character*, 234–8; Blaauw, “Contrasts,” 357–94; *idem*, *Cultus et decor*, i, 73–4; *idem*, “Following the Crosses,” 319–43; Wegman, *Christian Worship*, 33–4.

¹⁷⁹ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 1102–4. Cf. Baldovin, *Urban Character*, 159–60; V. Saxer, *Sainte-Marie-Majeure: une basilique de Rome dans l'histoire de la ville et de son église, V^e–XIII^e siècle* (Rome, 2001), 133–6.

¹⁸⁰ Gregory of Tours, *Gregorii Turonensis Opera*, Vol. 1: *Libri historiarum* X, ed. B. Krusch, *Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* (Hanover, 1937), 479–81.

¹⁸¹ LP (Mommsen), 215: “... letania exeat a sancto Hadriano et ad sanctam Mariam populus occurrat.”

¹⁸² See C. Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (New York, 1992), esp. 171–223; D.I. Kertzer, *Ritual, Politics, and Power* (New Haven, 1988), esp. 35–56, 77–124.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*

to the hierarchy by being lined up in procession, and through carefully defined positions in the liturgy. Everyone's exact position in the Church would be manifest to other clergy and to the populace at large in the city of Rome. Their roles in the liturgy and impressive vestments and furnishings would have generated esteem for their offices. This must have helped to make the ministers in the processions appear holy in the eyes of the faithful.¹⁸⁴

Despite the canniness of using liturgy as a tool to order the papal court, the documents belie the recurrent problems that the papal court faced in reality. The problems began with deciding who got to be pope. During the papal interregna preceding Conon's and Sergius' reigns,¹⁸⁵ fights broke out in Rome over papal succession. Before Conon's election, the three most highly ranking priests in Rome vied with one another for the papacy, and before Sergius' election, the archdeacon and archpriest battled for the see. Conon's and Sergius' lives also make clear that factions of the population had formed around these candidates.¹⁸⁶ Before Paul I won out and became pope, a segment of the population had thrown their support behind the Roman archdeacon Theophylact.¹⁸⁷ These periods were particularly dangerous because they gave the imperial government an excuse to get involved in Roman politics, such as when, after Sergius' election, the exarch John Platys came from Ravenna to collect the bribe promised to him by one of the rival candidates.¹⁸⁸ There was also an eternal danger. According to Gregory I, choosing the wrong candidate among rival popes could affect one's station in the afterlife.¹⁸⁹ Liturgy helped to exalt the pope once he was in power, but before that point rival claimants would freely engage in battles.

Even if papal liturgy was specifically designed to create clear lines of precedence among the clergy, it is obvious that this goal was not always successful. Beneath the neat order of precedence that ORI displays to the world, there were conflicts brewing under the surface of the papal court. Bishops were worthy of less respect than their clerical dignity and precedence might indicate. This is suggested by the listing of papal ordinations in the *Liber pontificalis*. Whenever the ordination of bishops is mentioned with Roman priests and deacons, bishops almost invariably come last.¹⁹⁰ It is likely that the clergy of the papal court viewed

¹⁸⁴ Saxer, "Chiesa di Roma," 524.

¹⁸⁵ For Conon: LP (Mommsen), 207; for Sergius I: LP (Mommsen), 210–11.

¹⁸⁶ LP (Mommsen), 207, 210.

¹⁸⁷ LP (Duchesne), i, 463.

¹⁸⁸ LP (Mommsen), 211.

¹⁸⁹ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, iii, 150, 152.

¹⁹⁰ The standard ordering in *Liber pontificalis* from its origins to the life of Hadrian I (772–795) is priests, deacons, and bishops from outside the city. See LP (Mommsen), 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 45; LP (Geertman), 171, 189, 190, 191, 193, 194, 196, 197, 198, 201, 202, 204, 206, 210, 212, 217, 218, 219, 221, 226, and 233; LP (Mommsen), 147, 154, 156, 158, 159, 160, 162, 167, 169,

bishops from outside the city of Rome as outsiders, unfamiliar with all of the complexities of the papal liturgy. For instance, when bishops substituted for the pope in celebrating Mass, deacons and not the presider signaled the other actors in the liturgy to act, as the pope did.¹⁹¹

If bishops did not attain the precedence that their clerical dignity would guarantee them, priests had similar problems. The archpriest is surprisingly inactive in the papal liturgy, only mentioned in one chapter of OR I (OR I:49), in which he is not himself acting, but only passively receiving the peace of the pope. The archpriest was still listed ahead of the archdeacon when announcing the members of the three-person council during a *sedes vacans*,¹⁹² but he was nowhere near being the influential figure the archdeacon was.

The priests, who ranked above deacons, acolytes, and the *primicerius* of the notaries, had much less of a role in the papal liturgies than these ministers. Since they were primarily responsible for attending to their duties at their own churches, they probably would have lived close to those churches and would not have been at home in the papal court and administration at the Lateran. It is striking that priests do not receive Communion from the pope at his seat like other papal ministers, as in OR I:109. Moreover, the problematic position of priests in OR I is confirmed by the ordering of ministers who distribute Communion in OR I:113–16, 18. From these chapters it emerges that the Eucharist is distributed according to the precedence of three distinct groups of the faithful, arranged by their precedence. For the purposes of analysis here, the interesting feature is the arrangement of the ministers assigned to this task. To the highest group of society, the pope distributed the consecrated bread, and the archdeacon gave the consecrated wine; to the second group, the bishops gave the consecrated bread and the deacons the consecrated wine; and to the final group, priests gave both the consecrated bread and wine. The rationale of this order seems first to be dictated by (to use an anachronistic term) the species of Communion: it appears that only ministers who could themselves consecrate the Communion were allowed to distribute it.¹⁹³ There was no need for the minister with the *sciffus* of wine to come in physical contact with it.

173, 177, 180, 184, 188, 191, 192, 199, 202, 218, 226; LP (Duchesne), i, 410, 421, 435, 456, 465, 469, 480, 514. Bishops come second when only priests or deacons are mentioned. For the former, see LP (Geertman), 222, 230, 235; for the latter, LP (Mommsen), 143, 165. The sole exceptions to this rule are the first two lives in LP (Mommsen), 4–5: In certain MSS of Peter's life, bishops are listed first, and in Linus' life, bishops are listed before priests.

¹⁹¹ OR II:4 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 115).

¹⁹² *Liber diurnus*, 113–114 (V59) = 211 (C58) = 318–20 (A53); 117–19 (V61) = 215–17 (C60) = 326–8 (A55); 119–20 (V62) = 217–18 (C61) = 328 (A56); 120–21 (V63) = 218–19 (C62) = 329–31 (A57).

¹⁹³ Cf. the biography of Pope Xystus I (c.120) in LP (Mommsen), 11, in which liturgical vessels could only be touched by the proper ministers.

This proposed explanation only resolves half the problem, however. It remains unclear why there is no corresponding minister to assist the priests in giving out consecrated wine. The situation created thereby entails that one group of priests gives the consecrated wine – seemingly the less prestigious of the two species – to the humblest group of the faithful, and thus both the archdeacon and the deacons rank ahead of these priests. Those who gathered at the Council in Trullo might well have had Rome in mind when they made reference to cities in which deacons were placed above priests.¹⁹⁴ OR I confirms the generalization that the priests of Rome “enjoyed administrative positions and prestige far below even the deacons.”¹⁹⁵ I suspect that many of the most promising candidates of the clergy were steered into the diaconate, because they had much more wide-ranging administrative duties than priests.

The power of the archdeacon was significant and far greater than his clerical dignity would indicate. In addition to the indications of his power previously discussed, examining precedence makes clear the implications of OR I:96. After the pope announces the Kiss of Peace in OR I:95, it is the archdeacon who in OR I:96 exchanges the peace with the other members of the clergy, and may in this function actually be serving as a stand-in for the pope. He starts with the first bishop, the second highest member of the order of precedence, and then works his way down the clerical grades. That this is the archdeacon’s task, and not the bishops’ or priests’, is further evidence that he was the pope’s right-hand man.

The ceremonial manager who composed OR I was savvy enough to know that bishops and priests, despite their high clerical grade, actually exercised far less power than the archdeacon and the minor clergy. As in the Greek East, conflicts could grow up in the liturgy when there was a significant difference between one’s ecclesiastical grade and the importance of one’s office.¹⁹⁶ The author of OR I tried at all costs to avoid the potential conflicts that might develop if someone who had real authority in the city of Rome was forced to walk behind their ecclesiastical superiors, in order to recognize their higher position in the order of precedence. I hypothesize that this is the reason that the bishops and priests do not participate in the opening procession. Instead, they wait for the pope in the nave enclosure.¹⁹⁷ They only take part in the recession at the end of the Mass, in which none of the minor clergy take part: there is instead a precipitous drop in precedence from the priests to monks. The order in which people were lined up in the liturgy of OR I was carefully calibrated so as to offend as few as possible! In neither the opening procession nor in the closing recession was

¹⁹⁴ *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 77–9.

¹⁹⁵ Reynolds, “Organisation,” 609.

¹⁹⁶ J. Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les offikia de l’Eglise byzantine* (Paris, 1970), 14.

¹⁹⁷ Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 84; T.F. Mathews, “An Early Roman Chancel Arrangement and its Liturgical Functions,” *Rivista di archeologia Cristiana*, 38 (1962), 73–95, at 75. Cf. LP (Duchesne), i, 218.

the entire papal court in attendance:¹⁹⁸ the people chosen to participate were carefully selected.

Finally, the system recorded in OR I is in no way as eternal as it first appears, but rather is a snapshot of precedence at one time. The orders of precedence sketched here do not tell the whole story of the structure of power in the ancient and early medieval papal court. The position of officers was constantly in flux. When the *Liber pontificalis* was compiled in the sixth century, the subdeacons were viewed as having ranked above the notaries, but by the time of OR I they had fallen in precedence.¹⁹⁹ The regionary *defensores* did not even exist before the time of Gregory I, and by Sergius' time, they ranked above the subdeacons, an older group.²⁰⁰ In the course of the seventh century, this group increased in stature. In the biography of Pope Constantine (708–715), a *sacellarius* was listed ahead of a *nomincolator*,²⁰¹ reversing the precedence implied by OR I.²⁰² Later Roman texts would incorporate cardinals.²⁰³ As in the late Roman orders of precedence in the *Notitia dignitatum*, societal orders were not eternally stable, but evolved over time.²⁰⁴ Everyone participating in and viewing papal liturgies would have known that the status of the ministers was not as rigidly fixed as their order in procession and Mass implied. There was always someone else waiting to move up in the ranks and seize another person's spot in the papal court.

Conclusion

Contemporary documents, and above all OR I, give us some idea of the tenor of life in the papal court of the late-seventh century. The most overwhelming sense that emerges is that of a group obsessed with the precise ordering of its members. This tendency was influenced by the militarization of late Roman society that had broadly permeated sub-Roman societies and provided a new method of organizing people in light of the crumbling empire. The minute planning of OR I was required to create a new order that was coming into being. Popes may

¹⁹⁸ Pace Jungmann, *MS*, i, 88 (for the former); and Mathews, "Early Roman Chancel," 78 (for the latter).

¹⁹⁹ LP (Mommsen), 27. The *Liber pontificalis* gives the origin of the subdeacons as being under Pope Fabian (236–250).

²⁰⁰ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 534–5.

²⁰¹ LP (Mommsen), 222–3.

²⁰² In OR I:10 their order in procession lists the *nomincolator* first.

²⁰³ For example, Liudprand of Cremona, *Antapodosis*; *Homelia paschalis*; *Historia Ottonis*; *Relatio de Legatione Constantinopolitana*, ed. P. Chiesa, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 156 (Turnhout, 1998), 174.

²⁰⁴ J.B. Bury, "The Notitia Dignitatum," *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 10 (1920), 131–54, at 139–41.

have promoted themselves as omnipotent religious and political leaders, but their positions were often contested. Popes drew upon the liturgy to reinforce the relationships of ministers in their court to prevent future tumult at papal elections, and to further increase the power of the papacy. Popes knew well that there were grasping clerics who wanted to sit in the seat of St Peter in their place. It made sense to promote a court in which power was fragmented among various bureaux, with only the pope at the head of all of them. The success of the papacy and the papal court was attributable, at least in part, to their mastery of ritual and the organization of people within it. Elaborate ceremonial would be one of the main strategies to cement and maintain the court's power. The form of the papal court on display in OR I would serve as a model for the future.

Within the corporations in the papal entourage, there was anything but harmony. Individuals were sensitive to their ranks and privileges, and constantly sought advancement. The stately form of the ritual should not blind us to the tensions behind the carefully constructed liturgy of OR I. The archdeacon and deacons in general had more clout than their ceremonial precedence indicates, while bishops from outside Rome and priests (including the archpriest) tended to have a relatively low status. The most favorably placed members of the court were those who had the greatest proximity to the pope, from whom the power in this society flowed. These included members of the minor clergy, especially the *primicerius* of the notaries, and ministers like the *vicedominus* who resided with the pope at the Lateran. These groups increased in stature, and gained specialized bureaucratic roles in papal government. Meanwhile, those outside the papal court lost power. Above all, this impacted the archpriest, the priests, and monks. The nobles of the city of Rome tended to have a limited role in papal ritual, and as the pope's power increased, they had had a correspondingly modest role in politics. As always, as one person in this society rose in influence, someone else fell. It was only for a brief moment as everyone lined up in their correct order for the Mass that the system looked as if it were stable, eternal, and ordained by God.

This page has been left blank intentionally

Chapter 3

Unifying the City through Liturgy

Introduction

The previous chapters have shown that the influence of the pope's liturgy on society was not neutral. It helped to call into being and organize a new creature, the papal court, and regulated its dealings with lay nobles in the city of Rome. The power of the liturgy, however, would have been limited if its influence were restricted to those people who had the most active role in its functioning. Instead, the liturgy also had a substantial role in shaping, forming, and informing with meaning the relationships of the people who participated in it, whether clergy or lay. The designers and enactors of the papal liturgy opted for expressions of worship that promoted and maintained a form of societal unity. This was already acknowledged in seventh- and eighth-century Rome:¹ many sources espouse the notion that the liturgy forges and sustains unity. This theme has generally been subject to theological treatment,² but as I hope to show, it has a profound importance for an understanding of the historical situation of Rome. Scholars have previously mentioned the power of the papal Mass to unite the population of Rome,³ but no one has explored what this unity entailed, viewed

¹ J. Bossy, "Blood and Baptism: Kinship, Community and Christianity in Western Europe from the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Centuries," in *Sanctity and Secularity: The Church and the World*, ed. D. Baker (Oxford, 1973), 129–43, suggests that the clergy attempted, with partial success, to create unity among dissenting factions in later medieval parishes with ritual, but without a full discussion or recognition of the long prehistory of this tendency.

² See notably W. Kasper, *Sacrament of Unity: The Eucharist and the Church*, trans. B. McNeil (New York, 2004).

³ J.F. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stational Liturgy*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 228 (Rome, 1987), 254; G. Ellard, *Christian Life and Worship* (Milwaukee, WI, 1940), 125, 133; J. Kramp, *Eucharistia: Essays on Eucharistic Liturgy and Devotion* (Saint Paul, MI, 1926), 39–41; P. Llewellyn, "The Roman Church in the Seventh Century: The Legacy of Gregory the Great," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 5 (1974), 363–80, at 378–9; J. Martínez Pizarro, *A Rhetoric of the Scene: Dramatic Narrative in the Early Middle Ages* (Toronto and Buffalo, NY, 1989), 144–5; R.D. McCall, *Do This: Liturgy as Performance* (Notre Dame, IN, 2007), 131–2; R. McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms* (London, 1977), 130; T.F.X. Noble, "Rome in the Seventh Century," in *Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies on his Life and Influence*, ed. M. Lapidge (Cambridge, 2005), 68–87, at 82; *idem*, "Topography, Celebration

it in the context of the Rome of the time, or made an attempt to explain the deeper causes behind this phenomenon.

The argument that the liturgy had a part in promoting and maintaining societal unity is deceptively simple. It will, in fact, require an extended discussion to encompass it. First it is necessary to show that this discussion was alive in seventh- and eighth-century Rome. It recurs in a variety of sources, including symbolic gestures in the liturgy; the theology of Maximus the Confessor; the prayers of the Gregorian Sacramentary; hagiography; and papal documents. In contrast to some anthropological studies that develop a similar argument, the examples I will concentrate on occurred in a period in which the main historical outline is known and thus one can see how the rituals worked within the society.⁴ While all of these witnesses express the central idea that liturgy and unity work hand in hand, they differ on how they describe that unity. Liturgical actions silently proclaimed it. In the dense language of a mystic, Maximus identified human unity as a mere first step in the eventual union with God. Prayers asked God to create concord among his people. Narrative sources demonstrated the practical effects of a belief that unity issued from the liturgy. After discussing these and other sources, the examination turns to why the idea of unity achieved through the liturgy acquired the cultural currency that it did.

Ritual Expression of Unity

The concept that the liturgy of the city of Rome could possibly join together people in a special way cannot be dismissed as merely a theory. There was a genuine connection between the way in which people conceived of liturgies and the way they organized them. As has been studied in other contexts, the actions of liturgies are informed by and often provide hints of the worldview of those who craft them.⁵ The designers of the liturgy of the city of Rome, from its origins to the time under analysis here, consistently opted for a liturgy that expressed the ideal of unity among its participants. Above all, they expressed this

and Power: The Making of Papal Rome in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries,” in *Places of Power in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. F. Theuvs and M. de Jong (Leiden, 2001), 45–91, at 83; J. de Puniët, *The Mass: Its Origin and History* (London, 1931), 176–81; G.G. Willis, *Further Essays in Early Roman Liturgy* (London, 1968), 4–6.

⁴ E.E. Evans-Pritchard, *Theories of Primitive Religion* (Oxford, 1965), 48–77.

⁵ For an interesting application of this insight, see F.H. Gorman, *The Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time and Status in the Priestly Theology* (Sheffield, 1990). Generally on liturgical actions, see *Gestes et paroles dans les diverses familles liturgiques. Conférences Saint-Serge XXIV^e semaine d'études liturgiques. Paris, 28 juin – 1^{er} juillet 1977*, Bibliotheca “Ephemerides Liturgicae,” “Subsidia,” 14 (Rome, 1978).

symbolism through the liturgy of the Mass and within the Mass, the celebration of the Eucharist.

In the ancient and late antique Church, the bishop had special authority over the liturgy. In any given city, there was one bishop. To preserve his authority and safeguard the integrity of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, he reserved certain liturgical prerogatives for himself: ordaining the clergy, imposing his hands on the newly baptized to confer the Holy Spirit upon them, and performing the only Mass in the city on Sundays and feast days.⁶ In a small city, it was not inconvenient for the bishop to celebrate the only Mass on Sunday.⁷ The congregations of cities were modest, and all Christians likely knew and were in close contact with the bishop. It was the bishop who initiated new members and led the celebration of the Mass that everyone attended. Large ancient cities like Jerusalem, Antioch, Constantinople, and Rome presented more of a problem. The earliest references to the celebration of the Eucharist in Rome suggest that, in Rome's first Christian communities, there was no one centralized Eucharistic celebration or one universally recognized bishop who could perform it.⁸ Even after the unification of the city of Rome under one bishop, the sheer size of the Christian community necessitated more creative solutions to serve the population's needs while maintaining the symbolism of unity. Rome and these other cities adopted a stational liturgy in approximately the fourth century, in which the bishops celebrated Mass in a cycle of churches throughout the ecclesiastical calendar.⁹ This allowed the bishop to manifest his presence throughout the cities as the single head of the Christian community. The Latin word *statio*, which described such a liturgy, came to refer to a meeting of all the faithful with their bishop for the Eucharistic celebration, through which they demonstrated their solidarity with him.¹⁰ As the Christian community grew in the fourth and fifth centuries, this form of liturgy must have helped to preserve cohesiveness and identity among Christians in the face of doctrinal conflict and political and economic crisis.¹¹

⁶ P. Nautin, "Le rite du 'fermentum' dans les églises urbaines de Rome," *Ephemerides liturgicae*, 96 (1982), 510–22, at 512.

⁷ Willis, *Further Essays*, 4.

⁸ P. Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*, trans. M. Steinhauser, ed. M.D. Johnson (Minneapolis, 2003), 364–5.

⁹ Baldwin, *Urban Character*. For the role of the stational system in unifying the population, see 145–6, 210–11, 214, 248, 254–5. See also S. de Blaauw, *Cultus et decor: Liturgia e architettura nella Roma tardoantica e medievale*, Studi e Testi, 355–6, 2 vols (Vatican City, 1994), i, 53–65.

¹⁰ C. Mohrmann, "Statio," in *Vigiliae christianae*, 7 (1953), 221–45, at 245.

¹¹ V. Saxer, "L'utilisation par la liturgie de l'espace urbain et suburbain: L'exemple de Rome dans l'antiquité et le haut moyen âge," in *Actes du XI^e Congrès international*

Beyond the organization of the city's liturgy into a stational system, collective action was part of the worship itself. For some of the liturgical celebrations in the city of Rome, the faithful would gather at a previously designated church – a *collecta*-gathering – before jointly proceeding to the main church for the celebration of the day.¹² In this fashion, even the act of attending Mass together was a sign of collective action among the faithful. Other popular processions were intended to achieve specific ends. According to both accounts of Pope Gregory I's (590–604) sevenfold processions to ward off the effects of the Justinianic plague,¹³ participants representing various groups of the population of Rome, whether clergy, religious, or lay, men or women, met at different churches around the city and converged on Santa Maria Maggiore. This physical and very public convergence must have served as a powerful expression of the liturgy as a means of gathering the citizens together to achieve a common goal.

Among the actions of the Mass, none were more striking expressions of unity than those connected with the celebration and distribution of the Eucharist. The Eucharist was an enduring symbol of unity in Christianity, the origins of which reach back to the earliest Christian congregations.¹⁴ The same Latin

d'Archéologie chrétienne, Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève, et Aosta, 21–28 septembre 1986, 3 vols (Rome, 1989), ii, 917–1031, at 924.

¹² This included the Mass of OR I, which explains the presence of cross-bearers: they led the processions of the laity to the stational churches from the churches where they had the *collecta*-gathering. See S. de Blaauw, "Following the Crosses: The Processional Cross and the Typology of Processions in Medieval Rome," in *Christian Feast and Festival: The Dynamics of Western Liturgy and Culture*, ed. P. Post, G. Rouwhorst, L. van Tongeren, and A. Scheer (Leuven, 2001), 319–43, at 324–5. Generally, on *collecta*-gatherings, see Baldovin, *Urban Character*, 158–66, 242; R. Hierzegger, "Collecta und Statio: Die römische Stationsprozession im frühen Mittelalter," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 60 (1936), 511–54; V. Saxer, "L'utilisation," 952–9. The four Marian feasts that Sergius introduced all had *collecta*-gatherings. The people would gather at Sant'Adriano in the Roman Forum, after which they would proceed to Santa Maria Maggiore. LP (Mommson), 215.

¹³ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 1102–4; Gregory of Tours, *Gregorii Turonensis Opera*, i: *Libri historiarum X*, ed. B. Krusch and W. Levison, *Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* (Hanover, 1937), 479–81. See J. Latham, "The Making of a Papal Rome: Gregory I and the *letania septiformis*," in *The Power of Religion in Late Antiquity*, ed. A. Cain and N. Lenski (Farnham, Surrey and Burlington, VT, 2009), 293–304. Unlike Latham, I find it questionable to assert Gregory was an innovator in creating or executing sevenfold litanies or if his predecessors had already made use of them. Absence of previous sources does not imply absence of the phenomenon.

¹⁴ P. Batiffol, *L'eucharistie: La présence réelle et la transubstantiation*, 6th edn (Paris, 1913), 161; P. Brown, "A Dark-Age Crisis: Aspects of the Iconoclastic Controversy," *The English Historical Review*, 88 (1973), 1–34, at 30; G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (New York, 1945), 247; W. Elert, *Eucharist and Church Fellowship in the First Four Centuries*, trans. N.E. Nagel (St. Louis, 1966); L. Hertling, *Communio: Church and Papacy in Early*

word, *communio*, expressed both the community and Communion: a mark of belonging to a Christian community was taking Communion with it.¹⁵ Different members of the clergy and laity contributed either bread, wine, or water at the offertory to be used as a part of the sacrifice, which demonstrated that they were part of one religious body.¹⁶ Receiving the Eucharist together meant that the faithful were part of the same group who recognized the same bishop and his teachings.¹⁷ Two patristic authors who expounded the theology of this theme in detail were Augustine (354–430)¹⁸ and Cyril of Alexandria (c.375–444).¹⁹ The idea that unity could be gained through the Eucharist remained significant throughout the early Middle Ages, conceived as a means for the faithful to join with Jesus and with one another.²⁰

An especially dramatic practice in the city of Rome that expressed the unity of the community from the fifth to at least the eighth century can be found

Christianity, trans. J. Wicks (Chicago, 1972), 23–8, 38; E.J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*, ed. R.J. Daly (Collegeville, MN, 1998), 32; W. Rees, *Die Strafgewalt der Kirche: Das geltende kirchliche Strafrecht, dargestellt auf der Grundlage seiner Entwicklungsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1993), 116–30.

¹⁵ K. Hein, *Eucharist and Excommunication: A Study in Early Christian Doctrine and Discipline* (Frankfurt am Main, 1973), 64–8, 165–71, 211–12, 246–50, 270–71, 412–44; J.A. Jungmann, “Fermentum: A Symbol of Church Unity and its Observance in the Middle Ages,” in *idem*, *Pastoral Liturgy* (New York, 1962), 287–95, at 287; W.M. Plöchl, *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts*, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Vienna, 1960), i, 60–1, 81.

¹⁶ E.G.C.F. Atchley, *Ordo Romanus Primus* (London, 1905), 86–7; Ellard, *Christian Life and Worship*, 128; Kramp, *Eucharistia*, 31.

¹⁷ G. D’Ercole, *Communio – Collegialità – Primato e Sollicitudo Omnium Ecclesiarum dai Vangeli a Costantino*, *Communio*, 5 (Rome, 1964).

¹⁸ W. Gessel, *Eucharistische Gemeinschaft bei Augustinus* (Würzburg, 1966); G. Bonner, “Augustine’s Understanding of the Church as Eucharistic Community,” in *Saint Augustine the Bishop: A Book of Essays*, ed. F. LeMoine and C. Kleinhenz (New York, 1994), 39–63. See in particular Augustine’s sermon 229 and 229A, in which the faithful were compared to the Eucharistic bread and wine, and described as belonging to a community unified in common virtues and actions, in *Sancti Augustini sermones post Maurinos reperti*, ed. G. Morin (Rome, 1930), i, 25–30. For translated excerpts from Augustine that stress the significance of the Eucharist for creating unity and peace, see D. Sheerin, *The Eucharist*, Message of the Fathers of the Church, 7 (Wilmington, DE, 1986), 95–9, 220–22, 309–12.

¹⁹ M.O. Boulnois, “L’eucharistie, mystère d’union chez Cyrille d’Alexandrie: Les modèles d’union trinitaire et christologique,” *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 74 (2000), 147–72.

²⁰ Y. Congar, *L’ecclesiologie du haut Moyen âge: De saint Grégoire le Grand à la désunion entre Byzance et Rome* (Paris, 1968), 86–90; H. De Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum: L’Eucharistie et l’Eglise au Moyen Age*, 2nd edn (Paris, 1949); R. McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789–895* (London, 1977), 115.

in the customs surrounding the *fermentum*.²¹ The *fermentum*, the Latin name of which refers to leavening, was bread that had been consecrated by the pope. Acolytes issued forth from the church in which the pope was celebrating Mass, carrying the consecrated bread inside of sacks, and delivered it to the 25 or so titular churches, the most ancient and important churches located in the city of Rome. The acolytes still fulfilled this function in the late-seventh-century papal Mass, which is why they received the sacks upon their ordination.²² When the priests who received the *fermentum* gathered their congregations for worship, they would place the piece of bread into one chalice on the altar, and pour wine over the bread. From this main chalice, they poured wine into the other chalices: contact with the consecrated wine in the first chalice was believed to consecrate the others as if the pope had consecrated it with his prayers. At this point, any of the faithful could receive Communion, by sipping the wine through a liturgical straw. There was, however, no option to consume consecrated bread at any church save for the one in which the pope himself celebrated Mass. On every Sunday in Rome only the pope was allowed to consecrate the bread. The consecration of the wine could only be performed by using bread that the pope had blessed. Communion in either of its two species – the bread or the wine – issued forth from the pope alone. In partaking of the Eucharist, then, the faithful proclaimed their symbolic unity with the bishop of the city and their fellow believers. In addition, the *fermentum* expressed the unity of the ministers who had the power to consecrate. When new bishops and priests were ordained by the pope, he supplied them with bread consecrated by him so that for a period of time they could continue to receive the Communion of their ecclesiastical superior.²³

The custom of the first mixing (*commixtio*) of the bread and the wine,²⁴ a special feature of Roman liturgy, is another manifest sign of ecclesiastical unity.

²¹ *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 61–4; J.F. Baldovin, “The Fermentum at Rome in the Fifth Century: A Reconsideration,” *Worship*, 79 (2005), 38–53; R. Cabié, *The Eucharist*, trans. M.J. O’Connell, The Church at Prayer, 2 (Collegeville, MN, 1986), 112; L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien: Etude sur la liturgie latine avant Charlemagne*, 5th edn (Paris, 1925), 196; Ellard, *Christian Life and Worship*, 131; J.A. Jungmann, “Fermentum: A Symbol of Church Unity and its Observance in the Middle Ages,” in *Pastoral Liturgy* (New York, 1962), 287–95; *idem*, *MS*, ii, 387–8; Nautin, “Le rite du ‘fermentum’”; Saxer, “L’utilisation,” 924–31; H.A.J. Wegman, *Liturgie in der Geschichte des Christentums* (Regensburg, 1994), 230.

²² OR I:101 for the acolytes’ departing from the papal Mass with the *fermentum* in sacks. See also OR II:6 and OR XXXB:65 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 115 and iii, 474). In OR XXXIV:2 (*Les Ordines Romani*, iii, 603), acolytes receive sacks as part of their ordination. On this point, see Willis, *Further Essays*, 6.

²³ V. Saxer, “L’utilisation,” 926–7. See OR XXXIV:44 (*Les Ordines Romani*, iii, 613); OR XXXVI:23 (*ibid.*, iv, 199); OR XXXIX:25 (*ibid.*, iv, 285).

²⁴ OR I:95.

This bread the pope used was consecrated by himself at a previous Mass. By joining the bread with the wine, he implied that both Masses were part of a single, unified liturgy.²⁵ It may even suggest a kind of temporal unity between the original instance in which the bread was consecrated and its insertion in the chalice.²⁶ The prayer or prompt that he delivered before this mixing was the *Pax domini*. This prayer made peace a necessary precursor to the unity of the Eucharistic elements, and required that everyone by their response affirm that state of peace.²⁷ When another bishop substituted for the pope in order to celebrate the stationary liturgy, he too used the bread previously consecrated by the pope.²⁸ Even in the absence of the person of the pope, the concept of a unified liturgy prevailed.

Other symbols silently reinforced the unity of the Church in the course of its worship. The pope used only one chalice. In a letter Pope Gregory II (715–731) wrote to the monk and missionary in Germany, Boniface, in 726, Gregory II stressed the importance of having only one chalice on the altar in ritual imitation of Jesus at the Last Supper: “... it is not suitable to place two or three chalices on the altar, when the solemnities of Mass are celebrated.”²⁹ Having one chalice at Mass was so significant to the self-understanding of the Roman clergy that when they had a larger congregation than could be supplied with one chalice, they had to improvise to give them the consecrated wine. This was the rationale behind the custom of *inmixtio*, by which normal wine would be consecrated by contact with wine already blessed by the celebrant.³⁰ This allowed the celebrant to consecrate only one chalice, but still have enough wine to give to the faithful. Similarly, only one receptacle was employed for the distribution of the bread.

²⁵ F. Cabrol, “Fermentum et sancta,” in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, 5 (1922), 1371–4; A. Fortescue, *The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy* (London and New York, 1937), 366–7; T. Klauser, *A Short History of the Western Liturgy: An Account and Some Reflections*, trans. J. Halliburton (London, 1969), 62; V. Saxer, *Sainte-Marie-Majeure: une basilique de Rome dans l'histoire de la ville et de son église, V^e–XIII^e siècle* (Rome, 2001), 122.

²⁶ Cabié, *The Eucharist*, 112.

²⁷ “Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum./Et cum spiritu tuo.” *L'ordinaire*, 86; *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 92.

²⁸ *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 125 (OR II:6): “Sexto loco, quando dici debet: *Pax domini sit semper vobiscum*, deportatur a subdiacono oblationario particula fermenti, quod ab apostolico consecratum est et datur archidiacono. Ille vero porrigit episcopo. At ille, consignando tribus vicibus et dicendo: *Pax domini sit semper vobiscum*, mittit in calice.”

²⁹ “... [C]ongruum non est, duas uel tres calices in altario ponere, cum missarum sollempnia celebrantur,” in *Epistolae Merowingici et Karolini aevi tom. I*, ed. E. Dümmler, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae*, III (Berlin, 1892), 276.

³⁰ M. Andrieu, *Inmixtio et consecratio. La consécration par contact dans les documents liturgiques du moyen âge* (Paris, 1924).

One paten was intended for the distribution of the bread; the chalice known as the *sciffus* was for giving the wine. In this way the faithful both ate and drank from the same initial source.³¹ As throughout the Middle Ages, sharing a meal created bonds and a sense of communal peace.³²

At this time, the clergy and the laity jointly had a role to play in the celebration of the Mass. The architecture tended to focus the congregation's attention on the rituals of the clergy around the altar, since there were no side altars in the churches and decorations were not overly elaborate.³³ Some of the artwork that existed in churches might have reinforced the message of unity, such as the painting of the meeting, embracing, and kissing of the Apostles Peter and Paul in the nave of San Paolo fuori le Mura.³⁴ The actions of the congregation further emphasized their unity. These groups responded to the prayers of the pope and chanted together. Three of the celebrant's prayers in particular – the collect, the prayer over the offerings, and the final prayer – addressed God collectively in the first-person plural. Both the celebrant and the faithful likely maintained the *orans* posture during liturgical prayer: eyes facing towards heaven, palms facing out, with arms at the sides flexed at the elbow and creating a 45 degree angle.³⁵ This stance, typical of ancient prayer, is attested in the decoration of the catacombs in Rome.³⁶ In the Roman miracle of St Anastasius, this is the posture in which the bishop and monks held themselves while praying for a little

³¹ Duchesne, *Origines*, 198. Some of the more exalted clergy drank directly from the chalice (*calix*) (OR I:107–10).

³² On communal bonds formed in the early Middle Ages by eating at a common table, see G. Althoff, "Der friedens-, bündnis- und gemeinschaftsstiftende Charakter des Mahls im früheren Mittelalter," in *Essen und Trinken in Mittelalter und Neuzeit*, ed. I. Bitsch et al. (Sigmaringen, 1987), 13–26.

³³ F.A. Bauer, "La frammentazione liturgica nella chiesa romana del primo medioevo," *Rivista di archeologia cristiana*, 75 (1999), 385–446.

³⁴ M. Gui, "La *Concordia apostolorum* nell'antica decorazione di San Paolo fuori le mura," in *Ecclesiae Urbis – Atti del Convegno internazionale di Studi sulle chiese di Roma (IV–X secolo)*, ed. F. Guidobaldi and A.G. Guidobaldi, 3 vols (Vatican City, 2002), iii, 1873–92; H.L. Kessler, "The Meeting of Peter and Paul in Rome: An Emblematic Narrative of Spiritual Brotherhood," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 41 (1987), 265–75.

³⁵ Duchesne, *Origines*, 111–13; Jungmann, *MS*, ii, 177–8.

³⁶ V. Focchi Nicolai, F. Bisconti, and D. Mazzoleni, *The Christian Catacombs of Rome: History, Decoration, Inscriptions*, trans. C.C. Stella and L.A. Touchette (Regensburg, 1999), 21, 70, 81, 108, 112–16, 137–8. These praying figures are symbols of *pietas*, but also reflect the genuine stance of early Christians in prayer. See P. Prigent, "Les orants dans l'art funéraire du christianisme ancien," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*, 72 (1992), 143–50, 259–87.

girl possessed by a demon.³⁷ People praying in this fashion were sculpted into a seventh-century tomb in Jouarre, France.³⁸

Other ritual actions tied together the clergy and laity. Representatives of the laity and clergy contributed bread and wine for the sacrifice of the Mass and then took Communion. Those assembled for Mass exchanged the Kiss of Peace. The ritual kiss had a long history in the ancient Church.³⁹ Church leaders promoted it as a symbol of a close community of faith set apart from non-Christians. There were two distinct exchanges of peace in the Roman Mass. The first occurred between the pope and the major clergy.⁴⁰ This peace took place just as the pope approached the altar: notably, in order to approach the altar and complete the sacrifice, the pope had to be at peace with his clergy. The more general exchange of peace happened much later in the Mass. Uniquely in Rome and cities that based the forms of their liturgy on Roman norms, this ritual took place immediately before the bread and wine were mixed.⁴¹ To unite the two Eucharistic elements, the population first connected in an outward sign of harmony.

Rhetorical Expressions of Unity: Theology and Prayers

The unity expressed in the actions of the Mass was not an idea that went unrecognized among the contemporaries of the seventh century. Several commentators of the seventh and eighth centuries portrayed unity as a desirable state and called on God to grant it to them. This idea comes across clearly in a brief gloss in a Biblical commentary of the seventh century: the entire purpose of the Sunday Mass was to create peace in the Church.⁴² It also emerges from

³⁷ *Saint Anastase le Perse: et l'histoire de la Palestine au début du VII^e siècle*, ed. B. Flusin, 2 vols (Paris, 1992), i, 175, 177 (Greek version); C.V. Franklin, *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian: Hagiographic Translations and Transformations*, Studies and Texts, 147 (Toronto, 2004), 355 (Latin version).

³⁸ G. Aliette de Rohan-Chabot, marquise de Maillé, *Les crypts de Jouarre* (Paris, 1971), 195–216. This is the tomb of Bishop Agilbert, which depicts the laity praying on either side of Christ in majesty.

³⁹ M.P. Penn, *Kissing Christians: Ritual and Community in the Late Ancient Church* (Philadelphia, 2005).

⁴⁰ OR I:49.

⁴¹ F. Cabrol, “Baiser,” in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, 2/1 (1910), 117–30, esp. 125–7; *L'Eglise en prière: Introduction à la liturgie*, ed. A.G. Martimort et al. (Paris, 1961), 421–2. Cf. the exchange of peace in the Ambrosian rite practiced in Milan, which occurs at the end of the Liturgy of the Word.

⁴² *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian*, ed. B. Bischoff and M. Lapidge (Cambridge, 1994), 416–17.

the Spanish encyclopedist and theologian Isidore of Seville (d. 636).⁴³ For Isidore the etymology of the term Church derived from its essential unity: “Hence the Church is given the name ‘the universal entity’ (*universitas*) from ‘one’ (*unus*), because it is gathered into a unity (*unitas*).”⁴⁴ The unity experienced in worship would emerge as a theme of another of Isidore’s works, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*. Although Isidore largely confined himself to discussing the origins of certain features of the liturgy, at times he provided an idea of the mentalities that supported or informed these practices.⁴⁵ For Isidore, the Kiss of Peace was to become a central moment towards producing the unity of the congregation. In discussing the seven prayers of the canon in the Visigothic Mass, Isidore commented:

After these, the fourth [prayer] is offered before the Kiss of Peace so that, everyone having been reconciled to one another in love, they might be worthily united in the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, because the indivisible body of Christ does not accept the discord of anyone.⁴⁶

In Isidore’s account, the prayer had to be spoken prior to the Kiss of Peace. It was the prayer that held in itself the power to heal divisions and bring together the congregation. The prayer was only the precursor to the unification of the faithful that occurred through the Eucharist. This was a necessary step, since the Eucharist was such a powerful symbol of unity that it would not accept a congregation fighting against itself. Isidore was also concerned with maintaining a certain harmony among the congregation during the rest of the service: this is why people had to chant, pray, and listen in unison.⁴⁷ Isidore is explicit about this when he discusses the need for people to keep silent during the readings

⁴³ On Isidore and the culture from which he came, see J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville: genèse et originalité de la culture hispanique au temps des Wisigoths* (Turnhout, 2000).

⁴⁴ Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, ed. W.M. Lindsay, 2 vols (Oxford, 1911), i, 304: “Hinc [Ecclesia] et universitas ab uno cognominata est, propter quod in unitatem colligitur.” I borrow this translation from *Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, trans. S.A. Barney et al. (Cambridge and New York, 2006), 173.

⁴⁵ For Isidore’s ideas on the liturgy, see P. Séjourné, “Saint Isidore de Séville et la liturgie wisigothique,” in *Miscellanea Isidoriana: homenaje a S. Isidoro de Sevilla en el XII centenario de su muerte* (Rome, 1936), 221–51. Helpful for its introduction and translation of this work was Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, trans. T.L. Knoebel (New York, 2008).

⁴⁶ Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, ed. C.M. Lawson (Turnhout, 1989), 17: “Quarta post haec infertur pro osculo pacis ut, caritate reconciliati omnes inuicem, digne sacramento corporis et sanguinis Christi consociantur, quia non recipit dissensionem cuiusquam Christi indiuisibile corpus.” The translation is from Knoebel, 39, with slight modification.

⁴⁷ Isidore, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, 8–9.

or certain chanting: "Thus also the deacon in a clear voice admonishes silence so that, whether Psalms are being chanted or the reading is being recited, unity might be observed by all, so that what is preached to all might be heard equally by all."⁴⁸

The theme of unity through the liturgy would emerge as a major theme in contemporary theology. Most notably, the greatest theologian of the seventh century, Maximus the Confessor (580–662), went into detail on how the liturgy not only could lead to unity among human beings but also eventually a joining with God.⁴⁹ Maximus had an eventful career: a monk and theologian who transformed himself into a polarizing figure. Unusually for an Eastern thinker of his time, Maximus embraced papal authority and developed into an outspoken critic of the imperially supported doctrine of Monothelitism, the idea (later judged heretical) that God and Jesus only possessed one single will. Eventually, Maximus would pay a high cost for his intransigence, having his tongue and right hand cut off, injuries that would doubtless contribute to his death. While not a Roman, Maximus had genuine ties to the eternal city that went beyond his promotion of the papacy. He spent several years there in the mid-seventh century to escape imperial persecution. In defense of his anti-Monothelite tendencies, he composed the acts of the Council of 649.⁵⁰ For years, scholars had assumed that this was an authentic council held and reported

⁴⁸ Isidore, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, 9: "Ideo et diaconus clara uoce silentium ammonet ut, siue dum psallitur siue dum lectio pronuntiatur, ab omnibus unitas conseruetur, ut quod omnibus praedicatur aequaliter ab omnibus audiatur." The translation is from Knoebel, 33, with slight modification.

⁴⁹ There is a large bibliography on Maximus' theology; here I cite only the items most relevant to my theme: G.C. Berthold, "The Church as Mysterion: Diversity and Unity according to Maximus Confessor," *The Patristic and Byzantine Review*, 6 (1987), 20–29; P.M. Blowers, "Maximus the Confessor, Gregory of Nyssa, and the Concept of 'Perpetual Progress,'" *Vigiliae Christianae*, 46 (1992), 151–71; I.H. Dalmais, "Mystère liturgique et divinisation dans la Mystagogia de saint Maxime le Confesseur," in *Epektasis, Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*, ed. J. Fontaine and C. Kannengiesser (Paris, 1972), 55–62; *idem*, "Théologie de l'Eglise et mystère liturgique dans la Mystagogie de S. Maxime le Confesseur," *Studia Patristica*, 13 (1975), 145–53; A. Louth, *Maximus the Confessor*, The Early Church Fathers (New York and London, 1996); A. Riou, *Le monde et l'Eglise selon Maxime le Confesseur*, Théologie Historique, 22 (Paris, 1973); P. Sherwood, "Survey of Recent Work on St. Maximus the Confessor," *Traditio*, 20 (1964), 428–37; L. Thunberg, *Man and the Cosmos: The Vision of St. Maximus the Confessor* (New York, 1985); *idem*, *Microcosm and Mediator: The Theological Anthropology of Maximus the Confessor* (Lund, 1965); W. Völker, *Maximus Confessor als Meister des geistlichen Lebens* (Wiesbaden, 1965); H.U. Von Balthasar, *Kosmische Liturgie: Das Weltbild Maximus des Bekenners*, 2nd edn (Einsiedeln, 1961).

⁵⁰ *Concilium Lateranense anno 649 celebratum*, ed. R. Riedinger, in *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, Series secunda, 1 (Berlin, 1984).

in Latin, until Rudolph Riedinger proved that the Greek text had been written first and only later translated into Latin; and the author of this work was none other than Maximus.⁵¹

Maximus' major work, *The Mystagogia*, is dedicated to a comprehensive interpretation of the deeper meaning of the liturgy.⁵² Above all, Maximus asserted that the liturgy was a special locus for creating unity.⁵³ He identified, in particular, four parts of the seventh-century Byzantine liturgy that were central in bringing about unity:⁵⁴ (1) The chant *Hagios* (meaning "Holy") that was said after the Small Entrance (a procession during which the ministers carry in the Gospel book) but before the readings are pronounced;⁵⁵ (2) the Kiss of Peace, which takes place after the diptychs (in which the dead and living are commemorated)⁵⁶ and the recital of the creed;⁵⁷ (3) the chant *Eis hagios*, which occurs after the elevation of the bread;⁵⁸ and (4) the reception of Communion after the *Eis hagios*.⁵⁹ Of course, the very name of the chant *Eis hagios* – translated as "One is holy" – signals a kind of sacral unity. There is a common feature that runs through all four of these liturgical actions. Everyone in the congregation participated in them; they were not reserved for the clergy.

In Maximus' view the effects of liturgy exceeded human unity. It certainly had a role in joining people, but Maximus would have envisioned terrestrial unity as the lowest form of unity it was able to achieve. In addition to societal unity, liturgy could move human beings towards a more exalted unity in heaven after death. It could bring them together with angels and God. The end of this process was becoming like God, to the point in which there was no distinction

⁵¹ See the collected articles about the Council in R. Riedinger, *Kleine Schriften zu den Konzilsakten des 7. Jahrhunderts* (Steenbrugge and Turnhout, 1998).

⁵² Maximus the Confessor, *La mystagogie de Saint Maxime le Confesseur*, ed. and trans. C. Sotiropoulos (Athens, 2001). Three translations have been helpful in my comprehension of Maximus' complex expression in the *Mystagogia*: *Maximus Confessor: Selected Writings*, trans. and notes by G.C. Berthold, introduction by J. Pelikan, preface by I.H. Dalmais (New York, 1985), 181–225; *The Church, the Liturgy, and the Soul of Man: The Mystagogia of St. Maximus the Confessor*, trans. J. Stead (Still River, MA, 1982); and *La mistagogia, ed altri scritti*, ed. R. Cantarella (Florence, 1931), 119–215.

⁵³ On this theme in Maximus, see Congar, *L'ecclésiologie*, 327–34; Dalmais, "Théologie de l'Eglise."

⁵⁴ For a reconstruction of the seventh-century Byzantine liturgy, see *Liturgies, Eastern and Western, Being the Texts, Original or Translated, of the Principal Liturgies of the Church*, ed. F.E. Brightman (Oxford and New York, 1896), i, 535–9.

⁵⁵ Maximus the Confessor, *Mystagogie*, 220–21, 246–7.

⁵⁶ R.F. Taft, *The Diptychs*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 238 (Rome, 1991).

⁵⁷ Maximus the Confessor, *Mystagogie*, 216–17, 246–7.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 204–7, 224–5, 246–7.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 246–9.

between the believer and God: humans would be mystically divinized, or united with God in heaven.

Each of the liturgical units that Maximus emphasized played a part in the ultimate union of the faithful with God, although Maximus is unsystematic in marking out exactly what each one did or distinguishing whether the liturgical actions cause the new states or merely symbolize states that would be fulfilled in the future. The *Hagios*, the angelic hymn, led to a union with angels.⁶⁰ The Kiss of Peace brought about the union of the faithful, first among themselves and eventually with God as well.⁶¹ The final two actions Maximus mentions, the *Eis hagios* and the reception of Communion, whether mentioned together⁶² or by the *Eis hagios* by itself,⁶³ produce a similar result. They lift someone to a place beyond ordinary human knowledge. One approaches towards God, though not through one's own agency: Maximus spoke of being led, opened, or gathered by God. The climax of this progression is when a person achieves union with God and is divinized. Through prayer, a person would be adopted as a son by the Holy Spirit.⁶⁴ In another passage, Maximus summarizes the entire process:

By means of the entrance of the holy mysteries, [there is] the more perfect and more mystical and new teaching and knowledge of God's design for us. By means of the divine kiss, [there is] the identity of concord and unanimity and love of all towards all, and of each person towards himself first and God ... By means of the *Trisagion*, [there is] the union and equality with the holy angels and the ceaseless, harmonious persistence of God's sanctifying glorification ... By means of the *One is Holy* and the things that follow [i.e. the reception of Communion], [there is] grace and affinity uniting us with God Himself.⁶⁵

⁶⁰ Ibid., 220–21, 246–7.

⁶¹ Ibid., 216–17, 246–7. The two passages do not imply that the Kiss of Peace has exactly the same characteristics. In the first passage, the Kiss of Peace only applies to peace among the faithful, and then only through the Word – i.e. Jesus – to God the Father. In the second passage, the Kiss of Peace is responsible for both forms of union, and Maximus adds a person becoming unified with himself before joining with God.

⁶² Ibid., 224–7, 246–9, 263.

⁶³ Ibid., 204–7.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 206–7, 246–7.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 246–7: “Dia de tēs eisodou tōn hagiōn mustērion tēn teleiōteran kai mustikōteran kai kainēn peri tēs eis hēmas oikonomias tou theou didaskalian kai gnōsin. Dia de tou theiou aspasmou tēn pantōn pros pantas kai pros heauton hekastou proteron kai ton theon homonoias kai homognoōmosunēs kai agapēs tautotēta ... Dia de tou trisagiou tēn pros tous hagiōus angelous henōsin te kai isotimian kai tēn apauston tēs hagiastikēs doksologias tou theou sumphōnon eutonian ... Dia de tou ‘eis hagios,’ kai tōn eksēs tēn pros auton ton theon henopoion charin kai kikeiōtēta.”

For Maximus and the contemporaries who read or heard this work, the power of the liturgy to forge unity occurred on multiple levels: it led to a mystical union with his fellow humans, angels, and, finally, God himself. This idea of union between God and man, known as *theosis* in Greek, would go on to have an influential history in the East, although it was viewed with suspicion and would remain an esoteric tradition in the West.⁶⁶

Maximus' words on the importance of unity were anything but idle. In defending himself against his Greek-speaking opponents, he acknowledged the widening theological and linguistic gap between the Latin West and the Greek East. He chose to side with the West because of their shared theological opinions rather than with the East, with whom he shared a common language.⁶⁷ His decision to refuse Communion with Emperor Constans II (641–668) because of the emperor's Monotheletism would result in Maximus' imprisonment and mutilation. Maximus' adversaries cleverly tried to exploit his strongly held beliefs in this regard. While being interrogated in Constantinople, his questioners falsely claimed that the papal ambassador to Constantinople, the *apocrisarius*, was prepared to take Communion from the patriarch of Constantinople, and thus that the pope's own minister was ready to establish a unity that Maximus was scorning.⁶⁸ The heretical beliefs that Maximus' opponents were promoting did more than cause discord. According to Maximus, the clergy who accepted Monotheletism were incapable of celebrating the Mass at all: "[W]hat kind of liturgy can they celebrate, or what kind of spirit can come upon [liturgies] celebrated by such people?"⁶⁹ Since in the East it was believed that the Holy Spirit was responsible for changing the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ at a moment called the *epiclesis*,⁷⁰ by this comment Maximus denied the ability of those who held heretical beliefs to consecrate at all.

Theological debates only touched a small number of the population of Rome directly, mainly the clergy. Even more pervasive, however, are the references to unity recurrent in prayer texts.⁷¹ Prayers implicitly reveal and shape the values of those who compose and invoke them. Since all of the Roman prayers were said out loud, and were heard by all of those in attendance, they would have formed their views as well; this is all the more true when one considers the constant

⁶⁶ For *theosis* in the works of Maximus, see especially J.C. Larchet, *La divinisation de l'homme selon saint Maxime le Confesseur* (Paris, 1996). For the Western tradition, see J.F. Hamburger, *St. John the Divine: The Deified Evangelist in Medieval Art and Theology* (Berkeley, 2002).

⁶⁷ *Maximus the Confessor and his Companions: Documents from Exile*, ed. P. Allen and B. Neil (Oxford, 2002), 70–71.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 62–3.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 60–61 (Allen and Neil's translation).

⁷⁰ John Moschos, *Spiritual Meadow*, PG, lxxxvii, 2869D, 2872A.

⁷¹ For my handling of prayer texts, see my Chapter 5 below.

repetition of fixed prayers over time. Prayers that make some reference to unity are a recurrent feature in the late-seventh-century Gregorian Sacramentary, the papal prayer book. Although the prayers in this sacramentary were composed over a period of centuries, they were all a regular part of papal liturgies in seventh- and eighth-century Rome. Many of these orations describe God and the saints as demonstrating and creating unity. Others proclaim the unity of believers in worship or request that God unify them.

The prayers of the Gregorian Sacramentary evoke an essential unity in the supernatural world of God and the saints. This begins with the persons of the Godhead, who are unified.⁷² But it extends to other heavenly beings as well: angels are said to celebrate jointly (*concelebro*).⁷³ Different terms describe the togetherness of saints in the afterlife: *coaptatio* (an accurate joining or fitting together); *coetus* (meeting, assembly, union);⁷⁴ or *collegium* (college or brotherhood).⁷⁵

The Mass that took place on earth was thought to be mirrored in the heavenly liturgy, with angels serving as a form of mediator between the two.⁷⁶ An angel was even thought to transport the body and blood used in the Mass to the heavenly altar, where the elements were blessed.⁷⁷ The late-seventh- and early-eighth-century ecclesiastical author Anastasius of Sinai was more explicit about the instrumental role that angels had in the sacrifice of the Mass: they officiated at the sacrifice, carried it to God, and made possible its consecration by God.⁷⁸ For Gregory I, the heavens were opened at the sacrifice of the Mass, and a choir of angels was present for it.⁷⁹

This sense of unity between heaven and earth extended beyond the angels. The saints enjoy a state of togetherness in the afterlife. But the heavenly world was not divorced from the temporal world – the two were seen as separate but connected. If they desired, God and the saints could cause change on earth if called upon to do so. One of the most frequent prayers in the papal sacramentary is a request for the intercession of saints on behalf of humans.⁸⁰ The unchangeable

⁷² *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 91 (formula 16), 92 (formula 19).

⁷³ *Ibid.*, i, 86 (formula 3).

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, i, 346 (formula 1010 [C]).

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, i, 291 (formula 768), 292–3 (formula 772).

⁷⁶ E. Peterson, *The Angels and the Liturgy*, trans. R. Walls (New York, 1964).

⁷⁷ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 90 (formula 13); *L'ordinaire*, 82 (*Supplices*).

⁷⁸ *Anastasii Sinaitae Quaestiones et responsiones*, ed. M. Richard and J.A. Munitiz, Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca, 59 (Turnhout, 2006), 9–10.

⁷⁹ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, ed. A. De Vogüé, trans. P. Antin, Sources chrétiennes, 251, 260, 265 (Paris, 1978–1980), iii, 202.

⁸⁰ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 91–2 (formula 19), 107 (formula 64 [PC]), 107 (formula 65), 109 (formula 71), 112 (formula 82 [C]), 119 (formula 108 [C]), 120 (formula 113 [PC]), 121 (formula 115 [OSO]), 122 (formula 117

prayer the *Communicantes* requested the saints' general intercession, but also their protection and assistance.⁸¹ God and his saints were said to be able to bind people together. God united a diversity of people in the confession of his name.⁸² God connected people into a proper society.⁸³ The Church was congregated by the Holy Spirit.⁸⁴ People were said to rejoice jointly (*congaudeo*) in the Spirit of God.⁸⁵ In some cases, the unity achieved was with God himself. God wanted to unite his Word with Mary in her womb.⁸⁶ In one of the prayers for the Mass of the blessing of nuns, God bound nuns to a yoke of concord and peace by their contract of marriage with God rather than with an earthly suitor.⁸⁷

[C]), 122 (formula 119 [PC]), 124 (formula 126 [PC]), 125 (formula 130 [PC]), 126 (formula 134 [C]), 126 (formula 135 [OSO]), 128 (formula 140 [C]), 210 (formula 463 [C]), 210 (formula 464 [OSO]), 211 (formula 465 [PC]), 211 (formula 466 [C]), 212 (formula 470), 212 (formula 471), 214 (formula 476 [C]), 215 (formula 482 [C]), 216 (formula 485 [C]), 217 (formula 488 [C]), 217 (formula 490 [PC]), 218 (formula 491 [C]), 218 (formula 492 [OSO]), 218 (formula 493 [PC]), 221 (formula 504 [C]), 234 (formula 556 [C]), 235 (formula 557 [OSO]), 235 (formula 558 [PC]), 236 (formula 562 [C]), 236 (formula 563 [OSO]), 237 (formula 566 [OSO]), 237 (formula 567 [PC]), 238 (formula 569 [OSO]), 239 (formula 571 [C]), 239 (formula 572 [OSO]), 239 (formula 573 [PC]), 241 (formula 582), 244 (formula 590 [OSO]), 244 (formula 592 [PC]), 246 (formula 597 [PC]), 246 (formula 598), 248 (formula 606 [PC]), 249 (formula 610 [C]), 250 (formula 613 [C]), 250 (formula 614 [OSO]), 251 (formula 616 [C]), 251 (formula 618 [PC]), 252 (formula 619 [C]), 252 (formula 621 [PC]), 254 (formula 626 [OSO]), 254 (formula 627 [PC]), 254 (formula 628 [C]), 255 (formula 632 [PC]), 256 (formula 635 [PC]), 257 (formula 639 [C]), 257 (formula 640 [OSO]), 258 (formula 644 [PC]), 259 (formula 647 [PC]), 260 (formula 650 [OSO]), 260 (formula 651 [PC]), 262 (formula 659 [OSO]), 262 (formula 660 [PC]), 263 (formula 662 [C]), 263 (formula 664 [PC]), 264 (formula 668 [C]), 265 (formula 670 [PC]), 266 (formula 673 [PC]), 267 (formula 676 [PC]), 267 (formula 679 [PC]), 268 (formula 680 [C]), 269 (formula 684 [C]), 270 (formula 687 [C]), 272 (formula 695 [PC]), 273 (formula 698 [PC]), 279 (formula 723 [C]), 280–81 (formula 728 [PC]), 284 (formula 738 [PC]), 284 (formula 739 [OSO]), 285 (formula 743 [OSO]), 285 (formula 744 [PC]), 285 (formula 745 [C]), 286 (formula 748 [C]), 287 (formula 750 [PC]), 287 (formula 752 [OSO]), 287 (formula 753 [PC]), 288 (formula 755 [OSO]), 289 (formula 759 [PC]), 289 (formula 760 [C]), 289 (formula 761 [OSO]), 290 (formula 764 [OSO]), 290 (formula 765 [PC]), 292 (formula 769 [PC]), 292 (formula 770 [C]), 293 (formula 774), 293 (formula 775), 296 (formula 786 [PC]), 306 (formula 825 [OSO]), 307 (formula 827 [PC]), 308 (formula 832 [PC]), 313 (formula 852), 318 (formula 878), 345 (formula 1009).

⁸¹ Ibid., i, 88 (formula 7); *L'ordinaire*, 76 (*Communicantes*).

⁸² *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 198 (formula 415 [C]).

⁸³ Ibid., i, 311 (formula 839 [PC]).

⁸⁴ Ibid., i, 231 (formula 542 [C]).

⁸⁵ Ibid., i, 340 (formula 993).

⁸⁶ Ibid., i, 128 (formula 141).

⁸⁷ Ibid., i, 309 (formula 835).

If the prayers of the liturgy show an interest in connecting people on earth with the heavenly world, they also suggest that worship was responsible for unifying the congregation on earth. One of the Eucharistic prayers, the *Communicantes*, proclaims the sharing together of people in the Eucharist.⁸⁸ Another prayer suggests that the purpose of the Paschal sacrifice is the covenant of human reconciliation.⁸⁹ Several prayers explicitly call to mind that people have assembled⁹⁰ or that they are God's entire family⁹¹ before making a supplication. This suggests that there was a special power in joining together and requesting something from God as an assembly of believers, rather than doing it alone. This possibility is strengthened by the command of the deacon to the parents and godparents present at three moments in seventh-century Roman scrutinies, one of the catechetical meetings that would culminate in the reception of baptism: "Finish your prayer as one and say: Amen."⁹²

Whereas some prayers assumed that a state of unity already existed, those that ask an absent unity to be created provide some of the most powerful evidence of the ability of the liturgy's role to create societal unity. In one prayer, the priest entreated that those whom God nourished by one heavenly bread or by the paschal sacraments be unified by God's piety.⁹³ One prayer bid that people divided by language might be congregated by their gift into one confession of God's name.⁹⁴ Another beseeched God to grant a restoration of their congregation.⁹⁵ Certain prayers expressed the desire that the oblations of the Mass would help to unite the world under the Church.⁹⁶ One prayer implored God to join his Church together for the praise and glory of his name.⁹⁷

Calls for unity were present at the initiation into Christianity: a prayer asks catechumens, those who were about to enter the Church, to be gathered

⁸⁸ Ibid., i, 88 (formula 7), 100 (formula 39), 104 (formula 52), 114 (formula 90), 172 (formula 330), 190 (formula 380), 192 (formula 386), 194 (formula 395), 220 (formula 500), 226 (formula 523), 228 (formula 529).

⁸⁹ Ibid., i, 200 (formula 423 [C]).

⁹⁰ Ibid., i, 244 (formula 593), 268 (formula 680), 304 (formula 817), 305 (formula 821).

⁹¹ Ibid., i, 88 (formula 8), 94 (formula 25), 172 (formula 331), 190 (formula 381), 192 (formula 387), 194 (formula 396), 196 (formula 403), 197 (formula 410), 199 (formula 418), 201 (formula 425), 202 (formula 431), 226–7 (formula 524), 228 (formula 530).

⁹² OR XI:11, 26, 87 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 420, 426, 444): "Complete orationem vestram in unum et dicite: Amen."

⁹³ One bread: *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 133 (formula 164 [PC]), 251 (formula 618 [PC]). Paschal sacraments: Ibid., 191 (formula 382 [PC]), 192 (formula 388 [PC]), 195 (formula 397 [PC]).

⁹⁴ Ibid., i, 224 (formula 516).

⁹⁵ Ibid., i, 145 (formula 220).

⁹⁶ Ibid., i, 87 (formula 5).

⁹⁷ Ibid., i, 180 (formula 355).

together by the font of baptism of adoption.⁹⁸ Several of the prayers request the true union that would occur only in heaven: that God may lead them to the society of heavenly joys,⁹⁹ that they might join the society and fellowship of saints,¹⁰⁰ for them to share in the fellowship of heaven¹⁰¹ of Jesus Christ,¹⁰² or of the mysteries of salvation.¹⁰³

The recurrent references to unity are not a feature restricted to papal prayer books or Latin liturgy at all. The doctrinal statement at the Third Council of Constantinople (680–681) explained that the divine and human wills of Jesus were in perfect unity with one another, literally in communion (*communione*) with one another.¹⁰⁴ The Roman antiphoner also praises unity: One antiphon lauds the Trinity, in part because of the unity among the different persons.¹⁰⁵ The prayers in the eighth-century Greek euchologion (prayer book) call upon God for unity, similar to Roman ones. They ask God to unify the petitioners with angels so that together they might celebrate and glorify God's goodness.¹⁰⁶ God is asked to unify the petitioners with the Church.¹⁰⁷ A specific prayer was provided to allow unity to prevail against divergent belief: there was a Byzantine formula for someone to renounce heresy.¹⁰⁸ Another prayer asks that the Scriptural readings unite the catechumens with the Church.¹⁰⁹

Liturgical Unity in Hagiography and Papal Biography

The ideal of unity was not confined, however, to the rhetorical expressions of prayers. The same themes played themselves out in spiritual tales and sayings of hagiography. Medievalists have long realized that despite the unreality of many of these spiritual tales, they communicate basic social realities and assumptions

⁹⁸ Ibid., i, 178 (formula 347).

⁹⁹ Ibid., i, 206 (formula 447).

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., i, 90 (formula 14), 255 (formula 633 [C]), 346 (formula 1010 [C]), 347 (formulae 1015–16).

¹⁰¹ Ibid., i, 94 (formula 26 [PC]) and 234 (formula 555 [PC]).

¹⁰² Ibid., i, 100 (formula 40 [PC]) and 153 (formula 254 [PC]).

¹⁰³ Ibid., i, 134 (formula 168 [PC]) and 299 (formula 796 [PC]).

¹⁰⁴ *Constantinople III*, in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, vol. 1, ed. N.P. Tanner (Washington, DC, 1990), 124–30, at 128–9.

¹⁰⁵ *Antiphonale*, 172–3.

¹⁰⁶ *L'Eucologio Barberini Gr. 336*, ed. S. Parenti and E. Velkovska, 2nd edn (Rome, 2000), 58 (formula 5, no. 2).

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 151 (formula 145, no. 3).

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 151–2 (formula 146, nos. 1–11).

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 246 (formula 286, no. 6).

about the world within them.¹¹⁰ It is only recently, however, that those who are studying the liturgy have begun to exploit these sources to probe the realities surrounding the performance of and attitudes towards worship.¹¹¹ As with most scholarly handling of these pious texts, what is important is not that the stories are literally true as written: even in stories crafted from whole cloth one can get the sense of the ideals of the writers and audience. While not a road map showing how people always behaved, these popular stories likely influenced human interrelationships. One striking instance of hagiography that expresses unity comes in the Roman life of the Persian saint Anastasius, whose relics had been transported to Rome. In particular, the unity that the liturgy brought about is expressed when one young girl was possessed by a demon. To expel the demon it was necessary to gather together the bishop and the entire monastic community; only when they all came together and chanted the *Kyrie eleison* was the demon driven out.¹¹² Once the demon had been expelled, the girl was reintegrated into the Roman community through the reception of Communion.¹¹³

The biography of the seventh-century Alexandrian patriarch John the Almsgiver has little historical authenticity, and generally succeeds in making its main subject a kind of Santa Claus figure.¹¹⁴ His life can nevertheless be useful in describing the contemporary culture of its author, Leontios of Neapolis. As patriarch of another major Mediterranean city, John knew well the power that the liturgy had to bring together or drive apart his flock. In one case, the bishop had to deal with a resentful deacon who refused to reconcile with someone.¹¹⁵ John solved the problem by refusing to give the deacon Communion according to his clerical rank until he forgave the other man. In another story, John exploited the resources of the liturgy to reunite feuding people through subterfuge. The bishop summoned two warring dignitaries to his oratory on the pretext of dealing with public affairs, and forced them both to attend the Mass he celebrated.¹¹⁶ John

¹¹⁰ See, for example, C.W. Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley, 1987).

¹¹¹ R.F. Taft, *Through their Own Eyes: Liturgy as the Byzantines Saw it* (Berkeley, 2006), 12–13; A. Angenendt, “Die Liturgie in der Vita des Johannes von Gorze,” in *L'abbaye de Gorze au Xe siècle*, ed. M. Parisse and O.G. Oexle (Nancy, 1993), 192–211.

¹¹² *Saint Anastase le Perse: et l'histoire de la Palestine au début du VII^e siècle*, ed. B. Flusin, 2 vols (Paris, 1992), i, 181 (Greek version); cf. C.V. Franklin, *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian: Hagiographic Translations and Transformations*, Studies and Texts, 147 (Toronto, 2004), 360 (Latin version).

¹¹³ *Saint Anastase le Perse*, 187. Cf. *Latin Dossier*, 360.

¹¹⁴ C. Mango, “A Byzantine Hagiographer at Work: Leontios of Neapolis,” in *Byzanz und der Westen*, ed. I. Hutter (Vienna, 1984), 25–41.

¹¹⁵ Leontios of Neapolis, *Vie de Syméon le Fou; Vie de Jean de Chypre*, ed. A.J. Festugière, *Bibliothèque archéologique et historique*, 95 (Paris, 1974), 359–60, 363–4.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 393.

had only the magistrate responsible for the argument say the part of the Lord's Prayer in which one asks for pardon for his offenses, a move that inadvertently caused him to ask for forgiveness from his enemy.

Some of John's hagiographical legends were written with a flair for the dramatic. Once, in the middle of celebrating the normal Sunday Mass, John was said to have dashed off the altar.¹¹⁷ His deacon simply repeated the same prayer over and over again, until the bishop should return and say his part. The reason for this unusual behavior was that the patriarch remembered that he had been feuding with one of his fellow clergymen, and unless he were reconciled with him, he would not be able to perform the sacrifice at the altar. John finally reappeared in triumph: after having made up with his brother, the rest of the Mass could proceed without incident. Celebrating Mass necessitated that the celebrant was at peace with his clergy.

Two stories from the papal biographies of the *Liber pontificalis* show how significant the liturgy could be for maintaining relationships with lay potentates. In 710, to cement the reconciliation between Pope Constantine (708–715) and Emperor Justinian II (685–693, 705–711) following their feud over ecclesiastical discipline, the pope celebrated Masses in the emperor's presence in Constantinople.¹¹⁸ One of the outward signs of their unity was that the emperor received Communion from the hands of the pope.¹¹⁹ To maintain the tenuous state of peace between the Lombard King Liutprand (712–744) and Pope Zachary (741–752), the pope celebrated Mass in Ravenna with the king in attendance.¹²⁰ The biographer stressed the outward signs of their unity: they exchanged greetings and the citizens welcomed the pope.¹²¹

Unity of Worship in Papal Writings (and Beyond)

The theme of unity through the liturgy reached to the highest levels of the Roman Church. The significance of unity is recurrent throughout Gregory I's works.¹²² He believed this conception of unity must be applied to bishops: they needed

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 359–60.

¹¹⁸ LP (Duchesne), i, 391.

¹¹⁹ LP (Duchesne), i, 391.

¹²⁰ LP (Duchesne), i, 430.

¹²¹ LP (Duchesne), i, 430.

¹²² P. Meyvaert, "Diversity within Unity, a Gregorian Theme," in *Benedict, Gregory, Bede and Others* (London, 1977), no. VI. This contribution was originally published in *The Heythrop Journal*, 4 (1963), 141–62. C. Straw, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*, Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 14 (Berkeley, 1988), 10, 12, 18–21, 26, 30, 31, 34, 45–6, 48, 58, 62, 65, 70–71, 74–5, 85, 88–96, 103, 106, 150–51, 153, 163–5, 177–8, 223–5, 227, 230.

to display a sense of fraternity in their relationships.¹²³ Unification, however, did not necessitate conformity. Under a broader umbrella of unity, there might continue to exist inessential differences. Gregory did not, for instance, insist that everyone in the Church follow the same liturgical practices, so long as everyone embraced the same hierarchy and beliefs.¹²⁴ Although people in the Church could retain their own practices, Gregory stressed that nothing done without a spirit of concord was pleasing to God.¹²⁵ Within the experience of joint worship this was especially critical if the sacrifice was to succeed at all: "See, God is not willing to accept the sacrifice of those who are at variance, he refuses to receive their holocaust."¹²⁶ The sacrifice of the Mass had a vital role in making peace between humans and God.¹²⁷

Gregory also described what he envisioned as the praise of the unity of the Trinity throughout the Old and New Testaments.¹²⁸ In particular, he focused on David, Isaiah, and Paul. In all the cases he described, these authors supposedly demonstrated a belief in the Trinity but then laid emphasis on the essential unity of the persons in it.¹²⁹ In Psalm 66:7–8, attributed to David, his first phrase uses God's name three times, but then his second shows that God is one; in Isaiah 6:3, Isaiah described the angels' "Holy, Holy, Holy," immediately followed by "Lord God," which was meant to express God's oneness; and in Romans 11:36, Paul makes reference to God or Jesus three times, but then adds a phrase at the end that again implies that God is singular.¹³⁰ The second two examples here would have additional resonance for Gregory, since the *Sanctus* and a variation of Romans 11:36 were part of every Mass.¹³¹ They served as constant reminders to him, and perhaps to some of his audience, of the unity of the Trinity.

Comparatively little is known about early medieval popes other than Gregory I. Few of the letters of the papacy are extant from the seventh and eighth centuries,

¹²³ L. Serenità, *Servi di tutti: Papa e vescovi e servizio della Chiesa secondo S. Gregorio Magno* (Turin, 1980), 125–41.

¹²⁴ H. Schneider, "Rom und die liturgische Vielfalt," in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, 49, 2 vols (Spoleto, 1994), ii, 1101–40.

¹²⁵ Gregory I, *Homiliae in Hiezechibelem prophetam*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL, 142 (Brepols, 1971), 106.

¹²⁶ Gregory I, *Homiliae in Hiezechibelem prophetam*, 106: "Ecce a discordantibus accipere non vult sacrificium, holocaustum suscipere recusat."

¹²⁷ Gregory I, *Moralia in Job*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL, 143, 143A, 143B (Turnhout, 1979–85), iii, 1240–41.

¹²⁸ Ibid., iii, 1482–3.

¹²⁹ Ibid., iii, 1482–3.

¹³⁰ Ibid., iii, 1482–3.

¹³¹ For the *Sanctus*, see *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 86 (formula 4); a version of Romans 11:36 is used in the *Per ipsum* in ibid., i, 91 (formula 16) and *L'ordinaire*, 84.

and the popes seem to have produced few other texts. Despite the fragmentary nature of the sources, however, one of the recurrent themes in papal letters of the seventh century was the unity of the Church on earth and in heaven.¹³² The earthly part of this equation would be an environment of consensus in faith and discipline under the authority of the pope; this was symbolically displayed by the communal sharing of the Eucharist.¹³³ The theme arises again in a letter from Pope Leo II (682–683) to King Ervig of the Visigoths, in which the pope sent him the translated acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (680–681).¹³⁴ Now that the Church had rejected the errors of the heretics, Jesus could be preached by all his priests.¹³⁵ Leo II stressed that there was an inextricable connection among orthodox teaching, unified worship, the well-being of the community, and salvation. Once heresy was driven out and the orthodox belief of the pope was embraced, the faithful could worship in unison.

Therefore let the sublimity of your Christian kingdom accept the zeal of piety, so that this is preached by all the churches of God, to the bishops, the priests, the clergy, and the people to the praise of God for the stability of your kingdom as well as for the salvation of all, so that God the omnipotent may be worshipped and praised by all people unanimously.¹³⁶

The letters preserved in the late-seventh-century formulary the *Liber diurnus* have been scrubbed of their original details, but the gist of the message in them is similar. Chanting the *Gloria in excelsis Deo* in San Pietro in Vaticano was a means for the addressee to demonstrate unanimity and peace with the pope while also being in agreement to support the papal doctrinal position against Monotheletism.¹³⁷

The issue of ritual unity, however, was not only a papal concern. The respect with which Roman liturgy was held meant that others imitated aspects of Roman liturgy. In at least one non-papal letter, the issue of unity hinged not only on joint acts of worship, but also on holding to the same calendar for liturgical feasts as Rome did. The seventh-century Irish author Cummin wrote to Abbot

¹³² P. Conte, *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei papi del secolo VII* (Milan, 1971), 305–48.

¹³³ Ibid., 322–34.

¹³⁴ *La colección canónica Hispana*, iii, Concilios griegos y africanos, ed. G. Martínez Díez and F. Rodríguez, Monumenta Hispaniae sacra, Serie canónica, 3 (Madrid, 1982), 200–205.

¹³⁵ Ibid., 203–4.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 204: “Idcirco et uestri Christiani regni fastigium studium pietatis assumat, quatenus haec omnibus Dei ecclesiis praesulibus, sacerdotibus, clericis et populis ad laudem Dei pro uestri quoque regni stabilitate atque salute omnium praedicetur, ut Deus omnipotens ab omnibus populis unanimiter glorificetur ac collaudetur.”

¹³⁷ *Liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum*, ed. H. Foerster (Bern, 1958), 157–64, esp. 159–60 (V85) = 231–8, esp. 233–4 (C66) = 353–63, esp. 355–7 (A61).

Ségéne of Iona about the controversy that raged in Ireland on the proper date for celebrating the most important liturgical feast, Easter.¹³⁸ Cummian held that the Irish Church should adopt the same calendar recognized in Rome.¹³⁹ He supported this view by invoking the necessity of maintaining unity with the universal Church – that is, the Roman Church as led by the authority of the pope. Anastasius of Sinai recommended praying together with others for things.¹⁴⁰ This was not because the prayers said jointly would be more efficacious, but instead as a guard against the solitary petitioner's falling into sin. If a lone person who prayed gained what he requested, it might lead them into arrogance, whereas a group participating together in prayer would all stay humble.¹⁴¹

Two cognate examples demonstrate that the conversation about unity and liturgy was taking place in the broader Mediterranean world. What is more, they show how the symbolism could be subverted during the liturgy to signal a protest. In 602, the people of Constantinople rioted against the Emperor Maurice (582–602), in the middle of a penitential procession, because of a lack of bread.¹⁴² The crowd exploited this opportunity to vent their frustrations, not only because of the emperor's presence but also because he was supposed to be unified with the population through their worship. The other example derives from the historian Agnellus of Ravenna, who wrote his *Book of Pontiffs of the Church of Ravenna* in the 830s and 840s on the pattern of the Roman *Liber pontificalis*.¹⁴³ This work drew upon a host of written and oral sources detailing the activities of the bishops of the see of Ravenna. The biography of Bishop Theodore (677–691) is particularly telling for this theme. When his clergy wanted to protest how he had maltreated them, they refused to celebrate Mass with him on Christmas Day, an infamous event referred to by one scholar as the “Christmas morning strike.”¹⁴⁴ One of the main functions of being a bishop was

¹³⁸ Cummian's *Letter De controversia Paschali*, ed. M. Walsh and D. Ó Cróinín. Together with a related Irish computational tract, *De ratione computandi*, ed. D. Ó Cróinín (Toronto, 1988). For a succinct discussion of the Easter issue in Ireland, see B. Ward, *A True Easter: The Synod of Whitby 664 AD* (Oxford, 2007).

¹³⁹ Cummian's *Letter De controversia Paschali*, 70–74, 78–82, 88, 92.

¹⁴⁰ Anastasii Sinaitae *Quaestiones et responsiones*, 152–3.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² M. Higgins, “Note on the Purification (and Date of Nativity) in Constantinople in 602,” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 2 (1952), 81–3.

¹⁴³ Agnellus of Ravenna, *Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravenensis*, ed. D.M. Deliyannis, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis, 199 (Turnhout, 2006), 20–52 (on Agnellus' sources) and 288–99 (edition of the life of Bishop Theodore); *The Book of Pontiffs of the Church of Ravenna*, trans. D.M. Deliyannis (Washington, DC, 2004), 46–60 (on sources) and 236–46 (translation of the life of Bishop Theodore); J. Martínez Pizarro, *Writing Ravenna: The Liber pontificalis of Andreas Agnellus* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1995), 10, 44–60, 99.

¹⁴⁴ Martínez Pizarro, *Writing Ravenna*, 52–60.

to preserve the unity of his flock, but Theodore's actions had instead broken the bonds of unity so badly that the clergy refused to join him at Mass on one of the most important feasts of the liturgical calendar. Although Agnellus' retelling of this story is not a blow-by-blow account, this story almost certainly describes a real event that was well known in Ravenna. It is likely that Agnellus had a written source such as a resolution between the bishop and the clergy referring to some aspects of the controversy, and from this he wove a more elaborate story.¹⁴⁵ Even if the tale were not historical, however, it is clear that the significance of expressing unity through liturgy had not lost its symbolic force when Agnellus was composing his history of the Ravennate church.

Explaining Liturgical Unity

The idea that unity was expressed and maintained through the liturgy was constant. It cries out for historical explanation, and yet there is no one simple answer. The different possibilities that scholars have suggested can be evaluated, but must admit that it is impossible to determine which of them or which combination of them was determinative.

Certain passages of the Bible may have helped to generate and sustain the idea that worship could bring unity. In Matthew 5:23–24, Jesus exhorts his listeners to reconcile with a brother who has something against them before offering sacrifice. This passage was in common currency in contemporary Rome, since Gregory I cited it four times in his writings,¹⁴⁶ and it was read in Rome as the Gospel on the fifth Sunday after Pentecost.¹⁴⁷ The verses appear explicitly in the seventh-century saint's life of the bishop of Alexandria, John the Almsgiver, in a context that demonstrates that the author was drawing upon a readership who knew that unity could be communicated by joint worship.¹⁴⁸ Patriarch Anastasius II of Antioch (599–609) preached a sermon to the Eucharistic assembly in which he cited this verse, interpreting it to mean that one must heal resentments another person holds against you, not only to drop grudges the listener personally harbors.¹⁴⁹ In addition, the Biblical verses Acts 2:41–46

¹⁴⁵ *The Book of Pontiffs of the Church of Ravenna*, 240 n. 8.

¹⁴⁶ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, ed. and trans. A. de Vogüé, Sources chrétiennes, 251, 260, 265 (Paris, 1978–1980), iii, 204–8; *Homiliae in Hiezechielem prophetam*, 106; *Registrum*, i, 454–9; *Regula pastoralis*, ed. F. Rommel and trans. C. Morel, Sources chrétiennes, 381–2 (Paris, 1992), ii, 404–6.

¹⁴⁷ *Das römische Capitulare evangeliorum*, Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen und Forschungen, 28, ed. T. Klauser (Münster and Westphalia, 1935), 31, 76, 117.

¹⁴⁸ Leontios of Neapolis, *Vie de Syméon le Fou*; *Vie de Jean de Chypre*, 360.

¹⁴⁹ PG, lxxxix, 825–49, at 844–5. For translation and discussion, see Sheerin, *Eucharist*, 335–48, at 345–6.

contain an idealized description of the close-knit early Christian community, attributing part of their closeness to their worshipping together in the temple and houses.

The resources of the Bible were available to many in the early medieval world. Was there anything specific about the city of Rome that made the liturgy an important symbol of unity? Part of the reason may have been the diverse urban audience at papal Masses. More strikingly, the clergy of Rome were faced with the threat of being torn into factions. Numerous battles occurred at the elections of popes in the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries: for Popes Symmachus (498–514),¹⁵⁰ Boniface II (530–532),¹⁵¹ Conon (686–687),¹⁵² Sergius I (687–701),¹⁵³ Paul (757–767),¹⁵⁴ and Stephen III (768–772).¹⁵⁵ Pope Pelagius I (556–561) was even suspected of having murdered his predecessor Vigilius (537–555).¹⁵⁶ The biographer of Sergius I in the *Liber pontificalis* took it as a given that factions were a natural feature of papal elections in Rome.¹⁵⁷ The papacy attempted to staunch this tide by threatening with anathema anyone who gathered supporters for a future pontificate while the current pope was still alive,¹⁵⁸ but the need for such an injunction shows that it was a temptation. There must also have been friction between lay potentates of the city and the pope. The civil government of Rome must have resented that the pope seemed to be encroaching on its responsibilities. When Gregory II attempted to have some repairs done on the walls of the city of Rome, a tumult arose.¹⁵⁹ One possible interpretation of this disagreement was that lay authorities rioted because they did not want to see the pope become the head of urban government.¹⁶⁰ It would have been important to have some symbol that drew together the rather fractious lay and clerical populations in Rome. The special benefit of using ritual to resolve disputes is that it forces people to reaffirm their loyalty to the pope without having to examine or act upon any of the root causes of the tensions that

¹⁵⁰ LP (Geertman), 223–4.

¹⁵¹ LP (Geertman), 234.

¹⁵² LP (Mommsen), 207.

¹⁵³ LP (Mommsen), 212–13.

¹⁵⁴ LP (Duchesne), i, 463.

¹⁵⁵ LP (Duchesne), i, 468–73.

¹⁵⁶ LP (Mommsen), 155–6.

¹⁵⁷ LP (Mommsen), 210.

¹⁵⁸ LP (Mommsen), 164.

¹⁵⁹ LP (Duchesne), i, 396.

¹⁶⁰ P. Delogu, “Gregorio II,” in *Enciclopedia dei papi*, 3 vols (Rome, 2000), i, 647–51, at 647.

may have existed.¹⁶¹ They only had to follow the actions required by the ruler, who could not probe what they truly thought of him and his power.

Beyond the walls of the city of Rome, the Roman Empire as a whole was breaking apart. At its height the Roman Empire experienced an impressive amount of cultural unity for a pre-modern society. One of the greatest accomplishments praised by Roman panegyrics was that the Empire had unified the civilized world into one large city-state, and by its army and administration brought the benefits of peace and well-being throughout this entire area.¹⁶² Even the form of divided government that often held sway in the Roman Empire in Late Antiquity, including having more than one emperor, did not endanger the unified running of the government or the sense that the empire was still one.¹⁶³ Yet by the seventh century, this unity had ebbed away and smaller worlds had risen in its place. The citizens of the city of Rome, formerly the greatest city of the ancient world, must have felt this acutely. They were surrounded by the crumbling monuments of Antiquity.¹⁶⁴ The long-distance shipping across the Mediterranean had largely come to an end.¹⁶⁵ The population of the city had dropped precipitously, and many of the inhabitants lived in tiny settlements scattered around the city.¹⁶⁶ Many forms of ancient ceremonial had fallen out of use, with nothing to replace them.¹⁶⁷ Outside threats loomed. The Arian Lombards seemed poised to strike Rome at any moment.¹⁶⁸ The heresies of Monophysitism, Monoenergism, and Monotheletism rent the fabric of orthodox belief.¹⁶⁹ In the face of all of these tendencies that created dissension,

¹⁶¹ M. Gluckman, *Politics, Law and Ritual in Tribal Society* (Chicago, 1965), 247. See also C. Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (New York, 1992), esp. 182–96, and D.I. Kertzer, *Ritual, Politics, and Power* (New Haven, 1988), esp. 57–76.

¹⁶² M.I. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Oxford, 1963), ii, 127–9.

¹⁶³ J.B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, 2 vols (New York, 1958), i, 16–18; A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602: A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1964), i, 325–6.

¹⁶⁴ Generally, see H. Saradi-Mendelovici, “Christian Attitudes towards Pagan Monuments in Late Antiquity,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 44 (1990), 47–61.

¹⁶⁵ P. Delogu, “La storia economica di Roma nell’alto medioevo: Introduzione al seminario,” in *La Storia dell’alto Medioevo italiano (VI–X secolo) alla luce dell’archeologia: convegno internazionale, Siena, 2–6 dicembre 1992*, ed. R. Francovich and G. Noyé (Florence, 1994), 11–29.

¹⁶⁶ R. Meneghini and R. Santangeli Valenziani, *Roma nell’Altomedioevo: Topografia e urbanistica della città dal V al X secolo* (Rome, 2004), 213–17.

¹⁶⁷ Noble, “Rome in the Seventh Century,” 82.

¹⁶⁸ T.F.X. Noble, *The Republic of St. Peter: The Birth of the Papal State, 680–825* (Philadelphia, 1984), 1–14.

¹⁶⁹ J. Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom* (Princeton, 1989), esp. 103, 107–8, 119, 184, 187, 207–18, 210, 250–59, 275–6, 340–41, 472.

the people of Rome might well have felt a sense of dislocation, and sought new markers to define their identity.

In this state of uncertainty, it was the pope, and not the distant and sometimes controversial emperor, to whom the citizens of Rome looked as a leader. The pope and his liturgy provided a local sense of identity in the face of a disintegrating empire, whereas the Roman emperor seemed responsible for nothing but famine and death.¹⁷⁰ The pope had the support of the local Italian army and population. When Justinian II attempted to have Sergius I abducted to Constantinople to answer for his rejection of the acts of the Council in Trullo in 692, Italians rallied around the pope and threatened to kill the emperor's representative, the exarch.¹⁷¹ A similar attempt by the exarch Paul to kill Gregory II because of his opposition to imperial taxation met with military resistance by the Romans.¹⁷²

The support for the pope against the emperor occurred on a rhetorical level as well. The biographers who composed the *Liber pontificalis* stressed the unity of the population in proclaiming new popes as a response to the external threat of the emperor's interference in their affairs.¹⁷³ The authors of the papal biographers explicitly said that although Pope Silverius (536–537) had been elected uncanonically, the priests still recognized him “on account of unity.”¹⁷⁴ While this may only be an apology formulated after the fact, it was calibrated to convince contemporaries. When the exarch Olympius tried to kill Pope Martin I (649–655), the Church of Rome was said to be united with the bishops, priests, and rest of the clergy of Italy.¹⁷⁵ The pope, rather than the Roman emperor, had become the local figure behind whom the population of Rome and wider Italy unified. The pope's liturgy may have been one of the reasons people came together in support of this new head of the city. More broadly, the liturgy, with all of its suggestion of unity, gave the Romans a concrete sense of belonging to something larger than themselves, something that replaced the weakened Roman state and culture. They had a common leader to their city, a shared faith, celestial protectors whose relics were still on earth, houses of worship, and joint liturgies. It certainly expressed that aspiration, and may well have contributed to making it a mental, as well as a political, reality.

The theories examined up to now are culturally specific to the Rome of the late seventh and eighth centuries. Yet the phenomenon of ritually induced social solidarity is cross-cultural, and examples of it range across time and space. In

¹⁷⁰ LP (Mommsen), 152.

¹⁷¹ LP (Mommsen), 212–13.

¹⁷² LP (Duchesne), i, 408–9.

¹⁷³ P. Daileader, “One Will, One Voice, and Equal Love: Papal Elections and the *Liber Pontificalis* in the Early Middle Ages,” *Archivum historiae pontificiae*, 31 (1993), 11–31.

¹⁷⁴ LP (Mommsen), 144 (“propter adunationem ecclesiae”).

¹⁷⁵ LP (Mommsen), 183 (“... sanctam Romanam ecclesiam quoadunatam cum omnes episcopos Italiae seu sacerdotes vel clerum.”).

thirteenth-century France, penitential processions created a sense of solidarity in the towns in which they were held.¹⁷⁶ In sixteenth-century Champagne, Corpus Christi processions contributed to a sense of belonging and quelled conflict in a time in which secular and sacred authorities were both weak.¹⁷⁷ In Renaissance Venice, civic ceremonial fostered communal life across different classes.¹⁷⁸ Anthropologists have observed that ritual actions promote unity. A recurrent focus of anthropology and religion is the relationship between society and ritual, and the means by which repeated behavior can create bonds or mediate conflict.¹⁷⁹ Max Gluckman placed ritual in the center of the life of a tribal society, and mentioned its ability to redress disturbances in social order and to create a unified community.¹⁸⁰ To give one example, a study of the Naven ritual among the Iatmul people of New Guinea argued that this complex of actions helped to hold together the society that performed it.¹⁸¹ This view is represented in some classic works in the study of religion. In his lectures on ancient Semitic religion, William Robertson Smith saw sacrifice as symbolizing and confirming societal obligations and a sense of belonging.¹⁸²

What explanations have been advanced to make sense of the tendency of ritual to forge unity? One anthropologist suggested that the perception of sacred, eternal time fostered by ritual breaks down normal social order and replaces it with a sense that a group of humans is acting as a single organism.¹⁸³ Another model claims that unifying rituals helped to create and sustain alliances between bands of people, which might be important for the survival of both groups in times of limited resources.¹⁸⁴ Yet another explanation is sometimes referred to as the “costly signaling” theory.¹⁸⁵ From this point of view, ritual behavior is

¹⁷⁶ M.C. Mansfield, *The Humiliation of Sinners: Public Penance in Thirteenth-Century France* (Ithaca, NY, 1995), 130–58.

¹⁷⁷ A.N. Galpern, *The Religions of the People in Sixteenth-Century Champagne* (Cambridge, MA, 1976), 69–93.

¹⁷⁸ E. Muir, *Civic Ritual in Renaissance Venice* (Princeton, 1981).

¹⁷⁹ C. Bell, *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions* (New York, 1997), 23–60.

¹⁸⁰ Gluckman, *Politics, Law and Ritual*, 227–65.

¹⁸¹ G. Bateson, *Naven: A Survey of the Problems Suggested by a Composite Picture of the Culture of a New Guinea Tribe Drawn from Three Points of View*, 2nd edn (Stanford, 1958), esp. 86–107.

¹⁸² W.R. Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites: Second and Third Series*, ed. J. Day (Sheffield, 1995), 251–71.

¹⁸³ R.A. Rappaport, *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity* (Cambridge, 1999), 216–35.

¹⁸⁴ B. Hayden, “Alliances and Ritual Ecstasy: Human Responses to Resource Stress,” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 26 (1987), 81–91.

¹⁸⁵ C.S. Alcorta and R. Sosis, “Ritual, Emotion, and Sacred Symbols: The Evolution of Religion as an Adaptive Complex,” *Human Nature*, 16 (2005), 323–59; L.R. Iannaccone, “Sacrifice and Stigma: Reducing Free-riding in Cults, Communities, and Other Collectives,”

a kind of signal to the other members of the community, proclaiming that a person is committed to the group and willing to contribute labor to promote it. Demonstrating unity with the group is seen as the primary purpose of ritual activity. Forms of rituals are often elaborate because it would be impossible to fake an attachment to a group that requires such an expenditure of time and energy. By these means, human societies can weed out freeloaders who only wish to feed off the group without contributing to it. One recent scholar has gone so far as to suggest that ritual and religion more generally are an evolutionary adaptation; groups that adopt religious belief and practice are unified, strengthened, and have a greater chance of survival.¹⁸⁶

Other studies suggest biological reasons that underlie the tendency to use the liturgy to form bonds. Broadly, religious practice confers biological advantage by creating an identity for a group and strengthening ties within it.¹⁸⁷ The root of the experience of unity in ritual may be physical, and researchers have suggested more than one mechanism that creates this sense. One model focuses on the sympathetic and the parasympathetic divisions of the automatic nervous system; either one or the other tends to predominate in normal bodily function.¹⁸⁸ When the body is subjected to prolonged rhythmic auditory, visual, or tactile stimuli, both systems are simultaneously excited. They in turn excite the area of the brain known as the median forebrain bundle, and this results in both pleasure and feelings of unity with other participants. Another model focuses on the workings of the central nervous system. The rhythmic stimulation of ritual may cause the two hemispheres of the brain to function together, an

Journal of Political Economy, 190 (1992), 271–91; *idem*, “Why Strict Churches are So Strong,” *American Journal of Sociology*, 99 (1994), 1180–211; W. Irons, “Religion as a Hard-to-Fake Sign of Commitment,” in *Evolution and the Capacity for Commitment*, ed. R.M. Nesse (New York, 2001), 292–309; R. Sosis, “The Adaptive Value of Religious Ritual,” *American Scientist*, 92 (2004), 166–72; *idem*, “Religion and Intragroup Cooperation: Preliminary Results of a Comparative Analysis of Utopian Communities,” *Cross-Cultural Research*, 34 (2000), 70–87; R. Sosis and B.J. Ruffle, “Religious Ritual and Cooperation: Testing for a Relationship on Israeli Religious and Secular Kibbutzim,” *Current Anthropology*, 44 (2003), 713–22; R. Sosis and E.R. Bressler, “Cooperation and Commune Longevity: A Test of the Costly Signaling Theory of Religion,” *Cross-Cultural Research*, 37 (2003), 211–39.

¹⁸⁶ D.S. Wilson, *Darwin's Cathedral: Evolution, Religion, and the Nature of Society* (Chicago, 2002).

¹⁸⁷ E.O. Wilson, *On Human Nature* (Cambridge, 1978), 151–3, 187–8.

¹⁸⁸ *The Spectrum of Ritual: A Biogenetic Structural Analysis*, ed. E.G. D'Aquili, C.D. Laughlin, and J. McManus (New York, 1979), and in this volume E. D'Aquili and C.D. Laughlin, “The Neurobiology of Myth and Ritual” at 152–82; E.G. D'Aquili, “The Myth-Ritual Complex: A Biogenetic Structural Analysis,” *Zygon*, 18 (1983), 247–69, at 262–4; E.G. D'Aquili and A.B. Newberg, “Liminality, Trance, and Unitary States in Ritual and Meditation,” *Studia liturgica*, 23 (1993), 2–34; and *idem*, *The Mystical Mind: Probing the Biology of Religious Experience* (Minneapolis, MN, 1999), 95–108.

unusual state that can result in feelings of unity with other humans or God. It is also possible that the experience of unity is chemical in nature. Certain rituals tend to create feelings of attachment and communal cohesion by stimulating the production of endogenous opioids.¹⁸⁹ These substances, produced naturally by the body, have the same positive physical effects as opium: they relieve pain, and cause relaxation and euphoria. It would make sense that the body's basic biological makeup rewards the tendency to remain in groups through positive physical reinforcement, since, evolutionarily, survival depends on group cohesion. Exactly how these physical explanations apply to the faithful in liturgy has yet to be precisely determined. However, the actions of the modern Mass have been observed to produce sensations of unity among participants that are consistent with the biological approaches sketched here.¹⁹⁰

Conclusion

When the liturgy of Rome in the seventh and eighth centuries was staged, the liturgy as a whole was widely understood to be powerful symbol of unity. The worship of Rome was formulated in such a way as to bond the population. The Eucharist especially was seen to represent a harmonious society. This observation appears widely in contemporary sources. Maximus the Confessor thought that the liturgy would join people among themselves, and then join them with God. The prayers of the Gregorian Sacramentary called upon the heavenly powers, the source of unity, to allow people on earth to congregate in similar fashion. The narrative sources show time and again that celebrating the liturgy with someone expressed or forged bonds. That unity derives from ritual is a cross-cultural phenomenon that has its roots in long-standing behaviors among humans, and may have a biological basis. The shapers of the liturgy of Rome may not have elaborated consciously the argument made in this chapter, and they certainly would not have made reference to the cross-cultural or biological explanations of how unity and ritual work. But they likely had an intuitive understanding how the liturgy could promote a feeling of unity, an ideal frequently and explicitly uttered by the texts that accompanied these rituals.

This chapter has given us greater insight into how the liturgy worked in the society of seventh- and eighth-century Rome. It was a symbol of unity in a city rife with faction and plagued by a sense of dislocation. It provided one way in which people felt part of a larger world. It was a sign of allegiance to a bishop and his doctrine. To attend Mass and participate in it meant that one accepted

¹⁸⁹ E. Frecska and Z. Kulcsar, "Social Bonding in the Modulation of the Physiology of Ritual Trance," *Ethos*, 17 (1989), 70–87.

¹⁹⁰ G.R. Murphy, "A Ceremonial Ritual: The Mass," in *The Spectrum of Ritual*, 318–41.

the authority of the bishop, and was unified with the other faithful. Liturgy could be exploited to reintegrate those who had been outside of the Christian community too. The people of the time, however, would not all have conceived of unity as merely a mundane state. Some would have seen it as a means to a greater union with God, the angels, and the saints. Even those who would not have reached the mystical heights would have thought that the prayer of a unified group was far more effective in God's sight than that of a solitary petitioner.

This study calls into question one of the most tenacious ideas on the unity produced through liturgy, that of Victor Turner's *communitas*, the special egalitarian form of community that supposedly comes to the fore in rituals.¹⁹¹ Turner argued that rituals had the capacity to negate or reverse the normal hierarchical patterns found in society; they brought people together in a fashion that existed outside of normal social patterns. It seems to me, however, that the unity created by Roman liturgy was not one of equals, even within the actual experience of worship. The carefully choreographed papal liturgies accomplished the opposite goal. In lining up the pope's ministers in a minutely planned way and assigning particular tasks to individuals, in appearing, riding, walking, entering, and exiting in a strictly ordered ballet of precedence, the rituals crafted a hierarchy that was meant to extend beyond the Mass. Rituals like these can at times underscore or reinforce the differentiation among members in a society. The liturgy in Rome exalted the pope as the head of the city, as the source of religious authority. The pope was the leader of the liturgy, the government of the city of Rome, and, increasingly, of Christianity in Western Europe.

¹⁹¹ V. Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure* (Chicago, 1969), 94–131. For further criticism of *communitas*, see *Contesting the Sacred: The Anthropology of Christian Pilgrimage*, ed. J. Eade and M.J. Sallnow (London and New York, 1991); M. Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge, 1991), 266–71; M. James, "Ritual, Drama and Social Body in the Late Medieval English Town," *Past & Present*, 98 (1983), 3–29, at 11.

This page has been left blank intentionally

Chapter 4

Defining a Society through Worship

Introduction

The pope's new form of ritual dominance helped to establish his power and form relationships with those subordinate to him. In addition, the shapers of liturgy endeavored to unify the population of Rome in a time when there was little else to hold it together. As the pope and other members of the clergy fought the battle to unite the city of Rome in a transforming world, they also redefined who was a legitimate part of that world. Previously, the subject of focus was the push towards unity, but many of the most telling sources from early medieval Rome and the broader Mediterranean have more to say about *disunity*. Ordering society was about more than identifying membership and forging unity; it also meant creating an "other" who no longer belonged to mainstream society. People who did not follow the proper liturgical norms or did not respect the clergy's authority in other ways were excluded from Roman society. Thus, Christian ritual of a certain brand – the pope's liturgy – achieved a monopoly on spiritual power. A communal sense and connection with others was tied to the worship to which one subscribed. Ignoring this new reality could separate offenders from the liturgy and the society around them.

The importance of studying "the other" has long been a mainstay in anthropology,¹ although how this concept relates to early medieval Rome or to Christian liturgy has not received much attention. The exclusion of others for religious or social deviance has been examined for later medieval Christianity,² but this same trend already exists on a more limited scale for Rome and its environs in this period. Distinctions based on some forms of alternative worship were a matter of concern for Rome's clergy, not only those based on alternative belief. The clergy would determine and enforce what valid worship was and

¹ See, for example, M. Augé, *A Sense for the Other: The Timeliness and Relevance of Anthropology*, trans. A. Jacobs (Stanford, 1998); B. McGrane, *Beyond Anthropology: Society and the Other* (New York, 1989).

² Most notably, see D. Iogna-Prat, *Order & Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam, 1000–1150*, trans. G.R. Edwards (Ithaca, NY, 2002); R.I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250*, 2nd edn (Malden, MA, 2007). More generally on marginalized groups, see B. Geremek, *The Margins of Society in Late Medieval Paris* (Cambridge and New York, 1987).

concomitantly who was a full participant in society. While surely not successful in imposing all of the norms they promoted, the clergy would mold a new series of expectations for behavior. So liturgy could forge solidarity with fellow orthodox Christians and mark the boundaries of society, regulating those who stayed within them, and excluding those who did not.

Regulation of Ritual

Knowledge of the liturgy was seen as one of the fundamental marks of civilization in the seventh and eighth centuries. One notable example appears in the life of the seventh-century Bishop John the Almsgiver, who reacted to a scandalous situation he learned about at a lake in Alexandria.³ Some boys employed to cut down papyrus were reputed to be engaging in sodomy. At least one of the causes of this behavior was that the boys had no exposure to religious beliefs or practices: they had no church or priest, nor had they ever heard Scripture or attended the liturgy. As part of his strategy to end their sinful ways and reincorporate them into society, John had them removed from where they were living, built them churches, and appointed priests to instruct and perform the liturgy for them. In this story, not knowing the liturgy was one facet of a life outside the fold of civilized behavior and polluted by sexual sin.

John the Almsgiver's concern for the liturgy and the effect it had on society was not unique. In the seventh century, the clergy kept careful watch over the kind of worship that was conducted. One was required to follow clerical norms or run the risk of being marginalized from society. Although much of the evidence for this trend stems from Rome, I will draw from contemporary evidence throughout the Mediterranean, where the same kinds of ritual norms were widely accepted. It becomes clear that this scrupulous attitude towards worship encompassed all levels of religiosity – from orthodox Christians, to disobedient Christians, to heretics, to Jews, and, finally, to pagans and magicians. These groups were continually in danger of punishment as long as they opposed the clergy who dictated appropriate ritual behavior.

The rules set down for the observance of liturgy did not demand complete uniformity in how to celebrate a liturgy like the Mass. So long as the same hierarchy and beliefs were accepted, Gregory I (590–604) took no issue with different forms of liturgy being conducted or hybrid forms that borrowed

³ “Une vie inédite de Saint Jean l’Aumônier,” ed. H. Delehaye, *Analecta Bollandiana*, 45 (1927), 5–74, at 22–3; “Un épitomé inédit de la vie de S. Jean l’Aumônier,” ed. E. Lappa-Zizicas, *Analecta Bollandiana*, 88 (1970), 265–78, at 276.

from more than one liturgical tradition.⁴ Isidore of Seville (d. 636) held that people should follow local liturgical traditions as long they contained nothing against orthodoxy or morality.⁵ While not insisting upon one standard manner for execution, certain liturgical norms were widely observed. The regulations for proper ritual behavior started with the main officiants, the priests who performed the liturgy. The Roman clergy, for instance, believed that there was something incompatible between celebrating the Eucharist and engaging in sex, and Roman regulations against sexual practice were known to be particularly conservative among Christian cities.⁶ To become a bishop in the first place, one had to swear against ever having engaged in certain sexual activities – namely, homosexuality, sleeping with a nun, bestiality, and adultery.⁷ Gregory I took a hard line on the issue, stating that sex disqualified a priest from presiding at Mass. In a letter to Januarius, bishop of Cagliari, he said that after having had sex, a priest can no longer celebrate Mass.⁸ In speaking with Peter, a subdeacon of Sicily, Gregory I stressed that if a priest did not distance himself from sex, he should not approach the ministry of the altar.⁹ The Roman Council of 743 maintained the same attitude on the connection between sexual purity and the Mass. If bishops were to take wives, they would have unclean hands and violate a church.¹⁰ In addition, priests were expected to observe a strict fast before celebrating the Eucharist.¹¹

Other regulations governed aspects of the clergy's behavior at Mass. The most obvious requirement was that a cleric needed to attend Mass: missing Mass three Sundays in a row would make him liable to be deposed.¹² Because of their significance for the liturgy, bishops were required to know the Psalms. This is a prerequisite Gregory I stressed in a letter to Ecclesius, bishop of Chiusi,¹³ and reinforced in another letter in which a deacon was disqualified from becoming

⁴ H. Schneider, "Rom und die liturgische Vielfalt," in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, 49, 2 vols (Spoleto, 1994), ii, 1101–40.

⁵ Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, ed. C.M. Lawson, CCSL, 113 (Turnhout, 1989), 48–9.

⁶ *The Council in Trullo Revisited*, ed. G. Nedungatt and M. Featherstone (Rome, 1995), 72.

⁷ OR XXXIV:16 (*Les Ordines Romani*, iii, 607).

⁸ Gregory I, *Registrum*, i, 244–6.

⁹ Gregory I, *Registrum*, i, 49–56.

¹⁰ Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Legum Sectio III, Concilia aevi Karolini, ed. A. Werminghoff (Hanover, 1906–1908), i, 8–32, at 12.

¹¹ *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 103–4.

¹² Ibid., 160–61.

¹³ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 839–40.

a bishop in Ancona because of his ignorance of the Psalms.¹⁴ The canons of the Council in Trullo (691–692) bolstered the authority of the bishop to dictate the location of the sacrifice: a priest could not celebrate inside private houses without his bishop's permission.¹⁵ Baptism was no longer to be carried out in residences but in regular parish churches,¹⁶ suggesting the council was working against private celebration of the liturgy in nobles' houses.

The clergy not only attempted to regulate the behavior of fellow ministers, but cast a careful eye on the faithful who attended the liturgy. They set down ritual requirements for the Mass and baptism, advised on the proper behavior of those at Mass, and described what the laity were expected to know. One had to prepare to receive the Eucharist before Mass by fasting, refraining from sex, and doing penitence.¹⁷ The Council in Trullo prescribed the proper ritual role the laity was supposed to perform. Like the clergy, the laity had to frequent church services. If any member of the laity was absent from Mass three Sundays in a row, he would be denied Communion.¹⁸ The council further admonished the faithful to attend church during Easter Week in particular.¹⁹ It also carefully dictated their movement and actions inside the church building. The laity was forbidden from entering the sanctuary.²⁰ The sole exception was the emperor. The laity was further dependent upon the clergy for the reception of Eucharist. The laity could not serve themselves the Eucharist or they risked being excommunicated for presumption.²¹ Rules for women were more restrictive. Women were not granted leave to speak during Mass.²² For Isidore of Seville it was a given that women were excluded from clerical positions and were unable to speak in church, preach, or baptize.²³

As the entry point to the Christian faith, baptism was a subject of interest for ecclesiastical authors. Isidore of Seville defined the benefits that were attached to baptism. Baptism had salvific power, a position ultimately derived from the New

¹⁴ Ibid., ii, 1081–2.

¹⁵ *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 106.

¹⁶ Ibid., 139.

¹⁷ P. Browe, "Die Kommunionverbreitung im Mittelalter," in *Die Eucharistie im Mittelalter: Liturgiehistorische Forschungen in kulturwissenschaftlicher Absicht* (Münster, 2003), 173–98. The monks in the Roman miracle of St Anastasius only ate a meal after Mass was completed. See *Saint Anastase le Perse: et l'histoire de la Palestine au début du VII^e siècle*, ed. B. Flusin, 2 vols (Paris, 1992), i, 185.

¹⁸ *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 160–61.

¹⁹ Ibid., 148–9.

²⁰ Ibid., 151.

²¹ Ibid., 138–9.

²² Ibid., 152. This canon is rooted in 1 Corinthians 14:34–35.

²³ Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, 87.

Testament.²⁴ What is more, baptism worked against the effects of Original Sin.²⁵ For baptism to be valid, however, a number of requirements had to be fulfilled. The whole Trinity had to be invoked.²⁶ The priest was the normal minister of baptism, since priests act in the person of the Apostles Jesus sent out to baptize.²⁷ In cases of emergency, though, deacons and even the laity were permitted to baptize.²⁸ Baptism could normally only be performed once in a person's lifetime, but there were exceptions to this rule. In one of his letters, Gregory I wrote that heretics baptized in the Trinity did not need to be rebaptized, but instead could be anointed with chrism, have hands imposed on them, or profess the orthodox faith.²⁹ Yet those not baptized in the name of the Trinity were not considered baptized at all and had to undergo the complete ritual. Isidore taught that those who were baptized into a heretical church and then converted to orthodoxy did not need to be rebaptized, but could be cleansed from their error by anointing with chrism and the imposition of hands.³⁰ The Council in Trullo outlined a similar procedure for converts from heresy. Depending upon the type of heresy that the newly converted had once followed, the ritual entailed either anointing, exorcism, or, in some cases, rebaptism.³¹ At the end of the process, the new converts were able to share in orthodox Eucharist. The decrees of the Council in Trullo advised that it was better to err on the side of baptism when it was uncertain if someone had been baptized rather than risk the possibility of remaining unpurified.³²

Long-standing prohibitions forbade rebaptism in the orthodox Church; authorities like Pope Leo I (440–461) and Augustine (354–430) had successfully imposed this norm.³³ Yet there was not necessarily a standard explanation of why this was so. The late-seventh- and early-eighth-century author Anastasius of Sinai improvised an original rationale for why heretics were not to be rebaptized.³⁴ He thought that heretics would feel ashamed to be rebaptized, and

²⁴ Ibid., 103. A. Oepke, "Baptō, Baptizō, Baptismos, Baptisma, Baptistēs," in *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. G. Kittel and G. Friderich, trans. G.W. Bromiley, 10 vols (Grand Rapids, MI, 1964–1976), i, 529–46, at 540–43.

²⁵ Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, 105.

²⁶ Ibid., 103.

²⁷ Ibid., 105.

²⁸ Ibid., 105.

²⁹ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 952–6.

³⁰ Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, 106.

³¹ *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 174–7.

³² Ibid., 164–5.

³³ E. Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2009), 674–5, 760–61, 765–6, 796–801.

³⁴ *Anastasii Sinaitae Quaestiones et responsiones*, ed. M. Richard and J.A. Munitiz, Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca, 59 (Turnhout, 2006), 21.

would presumably hesitate to submit to it. For Anastasius, there was no need for shame, since the Holy Spirit's gift of enlightenment could also be communicated through prayer or the laying on of the hands of the priest.³⁵

To be baptized, new initiates had to confess orthodox belief. This was the reason that the creed had to be said in the Roman celebration of baptism.³⁶ The basics of the faith required subsequent reinforcements. Minimally, a baptized Christian was to know the creed and be ready to recite it in front of the bishop or priests on Thursdays.³⁷ Knowing the creed, however, was mitigated in practice for those joining the faith. According to Isidore, a child or mute was allowed to have someone else confess the faith on their behalf.³⁸ Romans did not require the parents or godparents to say the creed at baptism: the clergy chanted it in either Latin or Greek.³⁹ One of Boniface's eighth-century letters revealed that certain priests did not force people to recite the creed at baptism.⁴⁰ Boniface himself was advised to provide spiritual instruction at baptism only to the zealous minority.⁴¹

The realities of baptism were often more complicated than they appear in normative sources. The haphazard nature of missionary efforts and the low quality of some of the clergy made it difficult to know if the standard rules were known or implemented.⁴² Gregory II (715–731) gave the missionary Boniface permission to baptize children if there were any doubts that they remained unbaptized.⁴³ Gregory III (731–741) reminded Boniface of the most basic form of baptism: so long as baptism was done in the name of the Trinity it was acceptable, and Boniface should also confirm the children with sacred chrism and the laying on of his hands.⁴⁴ As a result, laying hands on someone alone did not confer baptism, as one Irish person had been accused of doing.⁴⁵

³⁵ Ibid., 21.

³⁶ OR XI:62, 64 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 434–5).

³⁷ *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 159.

³⁸ Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, 105.

³⁹ OR XI:62, 64 (*Les Ordines Romani*, iii, 434–5). In this *ordo*, the priest chanted the Latin version of the creed, while the acolyte chanted the Greek version. Cf. *Liber sacramentorum Romanae Aeclesiae ordinis anni circuli* (Cod. Vat. Reg. lat. 316/Paris Bibl. Nat. 7193, 41/56) (*Sacramentarium Gelasianum*), in Verbindung mit L. Eizenhöfer und P. Siffrin, ed. L.C. Mohlberg, 3rd edn, *Rerum ecclesiasticarum documenta, Series maior, Fontes*, 4 (Rome, 1981), 48–50, in which an acolyte chanted both the Latin and Greek versions of the creed.

⁴⁰ *Die Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, ed. M. Tangl, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae selectae*, 1 (Berlin, 1916), 46.

⁴¹ *Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, 46.

⁴² On missionary work in the early Middle Ages, see R.E. Sullivan, *Christian Missionary Activity in the Early Middle Ages* (Aldershot and Brookfield, VT, 1994).

⁴³ *Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, 46.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 73, 173–7.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 173–7.

Some of the cases regarding baptism were more controversial. If the priests who performed pagan rituals had baptized children, Gregory III gave permission for their rebaptism,⁴⁶ but these were extraordinary circumstances. Pope Zachary (741–752) felt uncomfortable with Gregory III's blanket statement that infants baptized by priests who had performed pagan practices had to be rebaptized: after all, baptism had nothing to do with the morality of the baptizer but rather with the observance of the proper ritual form.⁴⁷ For Zachary, rebaptism was demanded only in cases in which priests who performed pagan actions were dead and thus it could not be confirmed that they had performed the ritual correctly.⁴⁸ Nor should one rebaptize infants if the only flaw in the original ceremony was a grammatical slip in Latin. Boniface recounted the story of a priest who baptized in the name of the daughter (*filia*) rather than the son (*filium*), a mistake that Pope Zachary said did not invalidate the baptism.⁴⁹

Regulating people's behavior at Mass was no easier. The communal Masses of the late ancient and early medieval world were popular affairs, but success bred its own discontents. Disapproving priests railed against the improper behavior of those in attendance. Many of the laity found ways to entertain themselves in the course of the liturgy, including talking rather than paying attention to the celebrant, telling jokes, gossiping, flirting, or attempting to do business or network with other attendees.⁵⁰ The sermons of St John Chrysostom (c.347–407) reveal that the faithful consumed the liturgy like theater, and enjoyed the technical aspects of preaching rather than focusing on its moral lessons.⁵¹ A component of a bishop's job was to steer the attention of the congregation to the clergy rather than one another.⁵² The Council in Trullo set out to curb inappropriate behavior of the laity during the liturgy. The faithful were not supposed to eat inside churches;⁵³ nor were they to chant badly or inappropriately.⁵⁴ In the Roman baptismal liturgy, the clergy commanded the faithful to be quiet and listen intently at certain points.⁵⁵ No similar admonition appears in the Eucharistic liturgy, possibly because there was less expectation

⁴⁶ Ibid., 50–51.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 173–4.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 174–5.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 141.

⁵⁰ D. Sheerin, "Eucharistic Liturgy," in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, ed. S.A. Harvey and D.G. Hunter (Oxford and New York, 2008), 711–43, at 717–18.

⁵¹ A. Natali, "Tradition ludique et sociabilité dans la pratique religieuse à Antioche d'après Jean-Chrysostome," *Studia Patristica*, 16, Texte und Untersuchungen, 129 (Berlin, 1985), 463–70.

⁵² Sheerin, "Eucharistic Liturgy," 717–18.

⁵³ *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 156.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 156–7.

⁵⁵ OR XI:46, 55, 68, 70 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 429, 431, 437, 440).

that it would be obeyed given the crowds at the papal Mass. Some of the laity departed the church before the service was completed. To combat people leaving in the middle of worship, John the Almsgiver exited the church in the course of celebrating the Mass and admonished them to return and pray.⁵⁶

Patriarch Anastasius II of Antioch (599–609) preached a greatly detailed sermon on the misbehavior of the laity during a typical Eucharistic celebration.⁵⁷ He complained of those preoccupied by worldly affairs like legal business or commerce.⁵⁸ Some spoke to one another or looked at pretty women; many left before the end of the service.⁵⁹ Others departed with the intention of having sex!⁶⁰ Anastasius compared the actions of the laity to how people behaved in a theater or a bath, as if the laity were there to be entertained.⁶¹ It was not enough to pray, which Anastasius anticipated that the congregation would do, but the laity had to pray in a spirit of contrition if God was to respond positively to their prayers.⁶²

Although Anastasius approved of the laity's receiving Communion, his words imply that there was a certain proper way to take the Eucharist that many in the congregation ignored. Some people came only to take the Eucharist and had little interest in the rest of the service.⁶³ Though people carried out the formal requirement to cleanse themselves with holy water before receiving Communion, Anastasius exhorted them to achieve the more important goal of cleansing themselves of sin through confession before taking the Eucharist.⁶⁴ They should not take the consecrated bread if still in a state of sin, and might be punished by God with sickness or death if they did.⁶⁵

Disciplining Disobedient Orthodox Christians

The clergy had spiritual weapons at their disposal to discipline those who refused to follow their moral and liturgical imperatives. The clergy's most important power was excommunication, which retained in this period its primary meaning

⁵⁶ Leontios of Neapolis, *Vie de Syméon le Fou; Vie de Jean de Chypre*, ed. A.J. Festugière, Bibliothèque archéologique et historique, 95 (Paris, 1974), 397.

⁵⁷ For the attribution, see S.N. Sakkos, *Peri Anastasiōn Sinaitōn* (Thessalonika, 1964), esp. 133–6. I am indebted to Daniel Sheerin for helpful discussion on this passage.

⁵⁸ Anastasius II, *Oratio de sacra synaxi*, PG, lxxxix, 829C, 832A, 836C–837A.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 829C–832B.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 829C–D.

⁶¹ Ibid., 833B.

⁶² Ibid., 836A–B.

⁶³ Ibid., 829C.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 832B–833D.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 833C–836A.

as exclusion from the reception of Communion, but also entailed exclusion from all activities of the community.⁶⁶ The legal definition and exact procedures of the Church regarding excommunication had yet to be hammered out and did not attract great interest until the twelfth century.⁶⁷ Excommunication in one form or another would serve as a threat the clergy could direct at different audiences, whether laity, monks, nuns, or other clergy. On the other hand, the laity could willingly choose to withdraw themselves from the Eucharist, either to protest against the clergy or as a matter of conscience.

Eucharist was such a fundamental symbol of unity for Gregory I that depriving anyone from it was a weighty threat. As Gregory put it, "... when a sin requires it, someone is appropriately driven out from the sacrament of Communion."⁶⁸ Although the sins that Gregory addressed were numerous, their common bond was a departure from what he envisioned as the correct ecclesiastical practice. There was no standard length of excommunication; those censured were excluded from Communion for a variable amount of time, except in cases in which someone was close to death and had to receive the final consecrated bread before death (the viaticum). Gregory's letters show when he resorted to this punishment. If the clergy, nobles, and people of Tolina supported a layman to become bishop, they would be cut off from Communion.⁶⁹ The pope's *defensor* was given the authority to deprive those responsible for the improper deposition of Bishop Januarius in Spain from Communion for six months.⁷⁰ The stakes for ignoring this ecclesiastical punishment were high. Gregory warned the people of Zara (Zadar) who had been excommunicated because of sin that receiving Eucharist in spite of the punishment would put their salvation at risk.⁷¹

⁶⁶ W. Daskocil, "Exkommunikation," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 7 (1966), 1–22, at 13–15; L. Hertling, *Communio: Church and Papacy in Early Christianity*, trans. J. Wicks (Chicago, 1972), 38; W. Rees, *Die Strafgewalt der Kirche: Das geltende kirchliche Strafrecht, dargestellt auf der Grundlage seiner Entwicklungsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1993), 116–21; *idem*, "Exkommunikation," in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, ed. W. Kasper et al., 3rd edn, 11 vols (Fribourg, 1993–2001), iii, 1119–20.

⁶⁷ E. Vodola, *Excommunication in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1986), 1–27.

⁶⁸ Gregory I, *Registrum*, i, 171 ("... exigente culpa digne quis a sacramento communionis abigitur ..."). For the reading *abigitur* in place of the *erigitur* of Norberg's edition, see *The Letters of Gregory the Great*, trans. J.R.C. Martyn, 3 vols (Toronto, 2004), i, 252.

⁶⁹ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 742. This letter incidentally shows that the well-attested trend in Late Antiquity of promoting a layman to the major clergy was still a reasonable option for some cities in the late-sixth century, however much Gregory disapproved of the practice. See A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602: A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1964), ii, 912–13.

⁷⁰ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 1052–5.

⁷¹ Gregory I, *Registrum*, i, 420–21.

In some cases Gregory I recommended leniency for the laity. A woman who had been excommunicated by her bishop for having left her husband but then returned to him without informing the bishop was to be restored to Communion, so long as she had returned voluntarily.⁷² In Gregory I's responses to Augustine of Kent, he said that the English who, out of ignorance, married their sisters-in-law were not to be deprived of Communion.⁷³ In response to Augustine's queries, Gregory also tried to establish whether certain impure states might cut people off from the liturgy. So Gregory I did not deprive a pregnant woman of baptism because her state was not considered sinful.⁷⁴ Nor did he exclude menstruating women from Communion because it was a natural condition, even though it was praiseworthy for such women to refrain voluntarily.⁷⁵ Recent intercourse or emission of semen could render one in an impure state, but the proper course of action hinged upon the circumstances. Gregory I said that someone who had intercourse with his wife for the purpose of begetting children and not for reasons of desire may be allowed to receive Communion, so long as he had washed and a short but unspecified amount of time had elapsed before entering the church.⁷⁶ Depending upon the mindset of the person, it was also possible for someone who had a nocturnal emission to receive the Eucharist.⁷⁷ If it was from a purely physical condition, there was no impediment to taking the consecrated bread after he had washed; if it had been the result of having impure thoughts, then the person should abstain for the day from the Eucharist.

If remaining in communion with the orthodox Church could be a challenge for the laity, John Moschos warned that even those pledged to a monastic way of life could occasionally fall out of communion. A certain simple, industrious monk received an angelic vision that was interpreted by a monastic elder as a sign that the young man must cease receiving Eucharist in whatever church he happened upon: he was exhorted by the elder only to take Communion in orthodox churches.⁷⁸ By following this advice he avoided the fate of being branded a heretic himself. In another story, Gregory I excluded a monk from

⁷² Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 564–5.

⁷³ *Gregorii I papae Registrum epistolarum*, ed. P. Ewald and L.M. Hartmann, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae 1–2, 2 vols (Berlin, 1887–1899), ii, 335–6. I take these letters to be authentic: See esp. P. Meyvaert, “Bede’s Text of the *Libellus Responsum* of Gregory the Great to Augustine of Canterbury,” in *England before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, ed. P. Clemoes and K. Hughes (Cambridge, 1971), 15–33, and reprinted in P. Meyvaert, *Benedict, Gregory, Bede and Others* (London, 1977), no. X.

⁷⁴ *Gregorii I papae Registrum epistolarum*, ii, 338–40.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, ii, 338–40.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, ii, 340–42.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, ii, 342–3.

⁷⁸ John Moschos, *Spiritual Meadow*, PG, lxxxvii, 3048C–D, 3049A.

taking Communion with his fellow monks because he accepted money against the provisions of the rule of the monastery.⁷⁹ He died before having been restored to communion, and avoided damnation only because a fellow monk read a prayer over his grave. The message here is clear: being out of communion with other monks could imperil the fate of one's soul in the afterlife, depriving one of salvation and eternal fellowship.

The threat of excommunication that hung over all sinners extended to nuns, as one of Gregory's anecdotes reminds us. Two nuns who refused to amend their arrogant ways remained under ecclesiastical censure after death and burial in the church. When a deacon called out that everyone who was not taking Communion was to get out of the way of those who were, the deceased nuns left their tombs and exited the church!⁸⁰ It was only after an offering was made on their behalf at Mass that the excommunication was lifted and they no longer carried on with their post-mortem wandering.⁸¹ Although it was no longer possible for the nuns to receive the Eucharist on earth, they were brought back into communion by receiving it from God through St Benedict.⁸² In this story, receiving Eucharist established a unity extending across heaven and earth.

Clergy who fell under the sanction of excommunication could neither celebrate Mass nor receive consecrated bread from another priest. This became a factor in one of the great controversies of Gregory I's reign, a dispute over whether or not the patriarch of Constantinople could use the title "ecumenical" patriarch.⁸³ Joint attendance at liturgies became one of the main issues in this battle. Although Gregory allowed the emissaries of the patriarch to celebrate Mass with him in Rome, thinking it arrogant to do otherwise, he did not allow his own deacon to serve at the Masses of the patriarch in Constantinople; if he ministered at the altar, the Roman deacon would be confirming the objectionable title "ecumenical" assumed by the Eastern patriarch.⁸⁴ When priests and other clergy served at the same Mass, it showed that there was a bond of unity among them. Celebrating or attending Mass with someone under ecclesiastical sanction infected with sin those who came to it.⁸⁵ One should as a result not celebrate jointly with anyone under papal condemnation.⁸⁶

⁷⁹ Ibid., 3072A–C.

⁸⁰ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, ed. A. De Vogüé, trans. P. Antin, Sources chrétiennes, 251, 260, 265 (Paris, 1978–1980), iii, 206, 208.

⁸¹ Ibid., iii, 206, 208.

⁸² Ibid., iii, 208.

⁸³ J. Richards, *Consul of God: The Life and Times of Gregory the Great* (London and Boston, 1980), 217–27.

⁸⁴ Gregory I, *Registrum*, i, 492–5.

⁸⁵ Ibid., i, 421–2.

⁸⁶ Ibid., i, 468–69.

Although not frequently remarked on by commentators of Gregory, issues of the reception or deprivation of Communion are commonplace in Gregory's extant letters. The examples and the people touched by Gregory's warnings or censures are numerous, but bishops, who possessed significant authority in this landscape, were frequent recipients of his missives. Natalis, bishop of Salona, was threatened with excommunication if he did not degrade a priest to the status of an archdeacon.⁸⁷ John, bishop of Justiniana Prima in Macedonia, was to be cut off from Communion for 30 days for mishandling the ecclesiastical controversy involving Bishop Hadrian of Thebes.⁸⁸ John, bishop of Larissa, was excluded from celebrating Mass or receiving Communion for his role in the affair with Bishop Hadrian.⁸⁹ In a letter to John, bishop of Justiniana Prima, Gregory gave John the power to exclude the deposed Bishop Paul of Docea from communion if he attempted to regain his see.⁹⁰ In a letter to Januarius, bishop of Cagliari, any cleric or layman found to have raped nuns in Sardinia was to be deprived of Communion.⁹¹ A letter to Amos, the bishop of Jerusalem, states that a Roman acolyte who was in hiding in Jerusalem could not receive the body and blood until he returned to Rome and submitted to the pope.⁹² John, bishop of Syracuse, was told to excommunicate the wayward bishop of Malta and his corrupt clergy, and only to restore them to communion when he judged that they performed the proper amount of penance.⁹³

Deprivation from the Eucharist could also be directed to those who aided and abetted others who neglected their ecclesiastical duties. Gregory demanded that a nun who had left her nunnery was to be punished and forced to return to her convent.⁹⁴ In this case, Gregory also directed that any layperson (presumably her family, although the letter does not specify) who attempted to impede the Church's *defensor* from returning her to the monastery would be suspended from receiving the Eucharist. Similarly, if any layman tried to stop Vitalian, bishop of Siponto, from punishing an undisciplined nun, the bishop was to bar him from participating in Communion.⁹⁵

Some cases were more idiosyncratic. In a letter to the people of Ravenna, Gregory advised on a difficult case involving the pope's emissary, Castor.⁹⁶ Gregory learned of a rumor circulating about Castor, and intended to reveal

⁸⁷ Ibid., i, 102–3.

⁸⁸ Ibid., i, 151–2.

⁸⁹ Ibid., i, 153–5.

⁹⁰ Ibid., ii, 982–4.

⁹¹ Ibid., i, 225–7.

⁹² Ibid., ii, 523.

⁹³ Ibid., ii, 585–6.

⁹⁴ Ibid., ii, 525–6.

⁹⁵ Ibid., ii, 525–6.

⁹⁶ Ibid., i, 407–9.

its falsity through his control over the Eucharist. If the person guilty of having made the charge refused to make the charge publicly, he should be denied Communion; but if the rumor was proved false, he should be punished with anathema, a more serious separation from the Church. On the other hand, if he publicly confessed that he had made an error, he would not have to be deprived of the Eucharist or his connection with the Church. In a letter to Januarius, the bishop of Cagliari, Gregory I tried to mediate a boundary dispute the bishop had with his neighbor.⁹⁷ Januarius' misdeeds – plowing up the crop of his neighbor and later removing boundary markers – were compounded by having done them before and after celebrating Mass. Gregory I withheld punishment from the bishop because of his advanced age, but told him that his unnamed advisors in this matter were to be excommunicated for two months. The first letters he sent were inadequate to resolve the issue, and Gregory would write another letter criticizing Januarius for his actions, stressing the responsibility the bishop had over souls.⁹⁸

As with Gregory, later popes had the authority to determine who could participate in Communion, and who was excluded from receiving or performing it. The clergy of Cagliari whom Honorius I (625–638) excommunicated could only appeal by coming to Rome to be tried by the pope.⁹⁹ The Roman Council of 743 excommunicated anyone who secretly married a nun and stripped any priest who gave them Communion of the priesthood.¹⁰⁰

It was one thing to institute bans that forbade people from taking Communion, but it was another thing to enforce them. From the evidence of Gregory's own letters, these prohibitions were not uniformly effective. Gregory asked Venantius, the bishop of Luni, to travel to the island of Gorgona because of his suspicions that an ex-priest there had resumed celebrating Mass.¹⁰¹ If found guilty, he would be deprived from receiving Communion even among laymen. Maximus, the bishop of Salona, had been consecrated without Gregory's permission and was disallowed from receiving or celebrating the Eucharist.¹⁰² However, Gregory's disapproving letters seemed to have fallen on deaf ears.¹⁰³ Despite Gregory's sentence, Maximus continued to celebrate the Eucharist and most of the people and clergy of the city ignored the papal condemnation. In a comparable case, Gregory complained to Chrysantus, bishop of Spoleto, that

⁹⁷ Ibid., ii, 546–7.

⁹⁸ Ibid., ii, 572–3.

⁹⁹ *PL*, lxxx, 478C–479B.

¹⁰⁰ *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Legum Sectio III, Concilia aevi Karolini, ed. A. Werminghoff (Hanover, 1906–1908), i, 8–32, at 13–14.

¹⁰¹ Gregory I, *Registrum*, i, 270.

¹⁰² Ibid., i, 314–18, 395–7, 421–2.

¹⁰³ Ibid., i, 234–5, 271–2, 371, 419–22, 468–9 and ii, 735–6, 616–17, 705–6, 734–6, 813–14, 816–17.

monks who had been deprived of Communion in other districts communicated in his city.¹⁰⁴

At other times Gregory was more conciliatory in his approach to fellow clergy. Gregory restored Magnus, a priest of Milan, allowing him to perform and receive Communion after his own bishop had excommunicated him.¹⁰⁵

It is clear from Gregory's letters that he was not the only one who invested the Eucharist with a broader societal significance. It was widely understood that sharing or withholding Communion was a means of signaling or resolving disputes. Refusing to receive Communion from a member of the clergy bespoke one's displeasure with him and constituted a public break. Gregory admonished Abbot Eusebius to return to communion with his bishop, which he avoided after having been insulted by the bishop.¹⁰⁶ Many in the congregation of Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, chose to withdraw from communion with him because of his destruction of images.¹⁰⁷ Because of a quarrel with a local nobleman, Bishop John of Syracuse refused to accept his Communion offerings, and did not permit the Mass to be said in the man's house.¹⁰⁸ This was an interesting case since it involved an individual member of the clergy pursuing a feud with a layman. The monks and leading lay figures in Roman society withdrew from communion with Pope Pelagius (556–561) because they believed that he was involved with the death of his predecessor, Pope Vigilius (537–555).¹⁰⁹ In order to prove that he had not harmed Vigilius, Pelagius staged a procession from San Pancrazio to San Pietro in Vaticano, where he ascended the ambo with the Gospels and cross over his head.¹¹⁰ In this way, both the break and the reconciliation with Pelagius were expressed liturgically. Bishop Severus of Aquileia was forced, along with other bishops, to participate in consecrating the Eucharist with John, the bishop of Ravenna, in spite of John's condemnation of the heretical Three Chapters and his public break with the pope.¹¹¹ Though he claimed to be forced into participation, Bishop Severus' flock refused to take Communion from him until he wrote a confession of his errors.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., ii, 660–61.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., i, 171.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., i, 116–17.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., ii, 873–6.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., i, 415–16.

¹⁰⁹ LP (Mommsen), 155.

¹¹⁰ LP (Mommsen), 155.

¹¹¹ Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, ed. L. Bethmann and G. Waitz, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Langobardicarum* (Hanover, 1878), 105–7. The verb *communicare* in this chapter refers alternatively to celebrating the Eucharist in reference to the clergy and receiving the Eucharist in reference to the laity.

In this period it was anticipated that the faithful would regularly partake of the Eucharist, but in certain cases they could choose to refrain from doing so. Isidore of Seville assumed that the faithful would take the Eucharist on a regular basis, because if the person were guilty of minor sins, it was a far worse thing *not* to receive the Eucharist.¹¹² Isidore considered Communion to be a kind of a medicine meant to help one achieve salvation.¹¹³ Only if someone were guilty of a grave sin was it incumbent upon them to refrain from receiving it.¹¹⁴ There were valid reasons to refrain from celebrating Mass aside from serious sin. Gregory I recommended that priests who had a nocturnal emission should abstain from celebrating Mass, but even in this case, he allowed an exception if it was a feast day and there was no other priest to preside at the Mass.¹¹⁵

Anastasius of Sinai identified instances in which it might be inadvisable for a person to take the Eucharist or in which people have problematic relationships with the Eucharist, although these are clearly presented in the framework of being deviations from the norm of regular reception. Certain people – Anastasius singles out Armenians – supposedly stay away from the Eucharist so they can continue to commit sin without having to purify themselves to receive.¹¹⁶ Others reputedly took the Eucharist as a safeguard against punishment for sin, although this was not the intended purpose of the Eucharist.¹¹⁷ There were even those who receive Communion with contempt, which, as in Judas' case, allowed Satan to enter into their souls.¹¹⁸ The only acceptable instances in which believers distance themselves from the Eucharist were periods in which they felt guilt or sorrow.¹¹⁹

Boniface had to deal with the socially inconvenient situation of removing himself from communion with other clergy. Boniface mentioned to Pope Zachary that although he tried to distance himself in spirit from immoral priests, it was difficult to do so in practice.¹²⁰ When Boniface went to the Frankish court, for instance, he saw priests there whom he avoided in other circumstances. Despite his interaction with them, Boniface drew the crucial distinction that at no point did he take Communion with them. In Zachary's eyes, Boniface had acted well in this matter.¹²¹

¹¹² Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, 21–2.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 21–2.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 21–2.

¹¹⁵ *Gregorii I papae Registrum epistolarum*, ii, 342–3.

¹¹⁶ *Anastasii Sinaitae Quaestiones et responsiones*, 93–4.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 93–4.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 93–4.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 93–4.

¹²⁰ *Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, 192–4.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 195–6.

Battling against Heretics through Liturgy

People could be cut off from the liturgy not only as a punishment for their actions, but also for their beliefs. Heresy, the acceptance of belief deemed deviant, represented a serious challenge for the Church in the early Middle Ages.¹²² Though primarily framed as a matter of belief, heresy had practical implications for the shapers and practitioners of the liturgy. One papal prayer asked God to restore a state of unity in the face of heresy.¹²³ When the Monothelete emperor Philippikos Bardanes (711–713) assumed the imperial throne in Constantinople in 711, Romans symbolically showed their disagreement with his false doctrine.¹²⁴ In addition to omitting his name from documents and coins, they refused to perform the liturgical introduction of his icons into a church or to allow his name to be mentioned in the prayers of the Mass.

Heresy had implications for the effectiveness of one's sacrifice. As Gregory I argued, the sacrifice of heretics could not please God unless they returned to the orthodox Church.¹²⁵ The popes and their allies denied that heretics had the power to consecrate. God did not accept the sacrifice of heretics, or even hear the words of their petitions.¹²⁶ Sacrifices could not be acceptable to God unless a Catholic performed them.¹²⁷ God only accepted a sacrifice from the one Catholic Church; it was the only true sacrifice, the sacrifice of Jesus.¹²⁸ Heretics came in many forms, but they all deviated from the proper forms of liturgy and in turn needed to be excluded from orthodox liturgy. The groups included the Montanists; Manichaeans; Arians; Monophysites, especially Acacius and Severus and their followers; adherents of Monoenergism; and a host of other groups, whether real or imagined.

The pages of the papal biographies in the *Liber pontificalis* are replete with stories that emphasized the power that the liturgy had to unite the popes with their friends and divide them from their enemies. Since many of these lives were written or compiled long after they originally occurred, one should not take all of them as literally true, but they illustrate the ideals that the people who wrote and read them held. Foremost among the enemies are heretics and those

¹²² For heresy in this period, see J. Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom* (Princeton, 1989), esp. 106–10, 206–11, 250–59; and more generally on medieval heresy, M. Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, 3rd edn (Oxford and Malden, MA, 2002).

¹²³ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 179 (formula 351).

¹²⁴ Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, 175–6.

¹²⁵ Gregory I, *Moralia in Job*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCL, 143, 143A, 143B (Turnhout, 1979–1985), iii, 1380.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, iii, 1781.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, iii, 1147–8.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, iii, 1781–2.

associated with them, who were to be rejected from communion. After he had supposedly expelled Manicheans from Rome, Pope Siricius (384–399) decreed that this group could not participate in Communion with the faithful so that they did not abuse (*vexari*) the Eucharist with polluted mouths.¹²⁹ Many of the clergy of Pope Anastasius II (496–498) removed themselves from communion with him because the pope was in communion with Photinus.¹³⁰ This deacon had in turn been in communion with the former patriarch of Constantinople, Acacius (d. 489), who was a Monophysite. By withdrawing from communion with Anastasius II, his clergy rejected the conciliatory nature of his approach to the Acacian schism.

Arians were among the heretical groups who did not practice liturgy correctly or maintain a proper relationship with God. The prayers of the Roman Mass were crafted in such a way that Arians could not pronounce them in good faith, since they refer to the equality of the three persons of the Trinity.¹³¹ For Gregory I, it was not acceptable to receive Communion that had been blessed by an Arian bishop.¹³² Arian bishops who practiced their liturgies were thought to call down divine punishment upon themselves. An Arian Lombard bishop who visited Spoleto was struck blind when he tried to force his way into an orthodox church so he could celebrate Mass.¹³³ The orthodox Mass had the power to cleanse a house of worship that previously hosted these heretics. When Gregory I celebrated Mass in Sant'Agata dei Goti, formerly an Arian church, an evil spirit who took the form of an invisible pig was expelled from the building.¹³⁴

The collection of pious sayings and stories in the *Spiritual Meadow* repeatedly showed the consequences of receiving Communion with heretics. Taking the Eucharist was proof that one belonged to the community of the celebrant who offered it. This common understanding allowed John Moschos to craft his polemical exempla to preach against the followers of the sixth-century Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, Severus. A Severan heretic who had forcibly torn out the consecrated bread from his wife's mouth when she took the Eucharist in an orthodox church and threw it on the ground guaranteed his

¹²⁹ LP (Geertman), 197. This translation for *vexari* is from *The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715*, ed. and trans. R. Davis, Translated Texts for Historians, 6, 2nd edn (Liverpool, 2000), 31.

¹³⁰ LP (Geertman), 222. On this affair, see J. Richards, *The Popes and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages, 476–752* (London and Boston, 1979), 67–8.

¹³¹ J.A. Jungmann, "Die Abwehr des germanischen Arianismus und der Umbruch der religiösen Kultur im frühen Mittelalter," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 69 (1947), 36–99.

¹³² Gregory I, *Dialogi*, iii, 386.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, iii, 376, 378.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, iii, 378, 380, 382.

own damnation.¹³⁵ In some cases, the saints took more direct action. St Mary blocked the entrance of a Severan heretic from the Church of the Resurrection in Jerusalem. Only once the heretic received consecrated bread and wine from a deacon of the orthodox Church was she allowed to enter.¹³⁶ When a military governor of Palestine attempted to enter the Church of the Resurrection, he had a terrifying vision of a ram charging at him.¹³⁷ Even after confessing his sins, he was unable to enter because of the same obstacle. Only once he admitted that he was in communion with Severus, and received Communion from the orthodox clergy, could he enter unhindered. The error of taking Communion with the Severan sect was viewed as similar to a sexual sin: a Syrian money-lender received visions that his brother committed adultery (*eporneusen*) with a tavern-keeper's wife, which was interpreted to mean not that he literally had engaged in intercourse but that he was in communion with Severus' church.¹³⁸ Miraculous signs further testified to the power inherent in the orthodox Eucharist. An orthodox Stylite in argument with a Severan heretic decided to submit their Eucharist to an ordeal. When boiling both pieces of consecrated bread, the heretic's bread dissolved but the bread of the orthodox person cooled the pot.¹³⁹

Even the normally moderate Anastasius established an absolute norm when it came to the proper reception of Communion. When traveling, it was best to bring along the Eucharist in a pyx instead of taking Communion in whatever church one encountered.¹⁴⁰ Unlike the anecdotes in the *Spiritual Meadow*, Anastasius provided a rationale for this strict position. He cited Romans 5:14, saying that there is one Lord and one faith, which he interprets to mean that there was only one orthodox Catholic Church and the other churches were not churches at all.¹⁴¹ Anastasius alluded to sexual sin, comparing taking Communion at a heretical church to a married man fornicating with another woman.¹⁴² Anastasius commanded his reader to keep faithful to the Church, the wife of Jesus.¹⁴³

In the hagiographer Leontios' life of John of Cyprus, the patriarch of Alexandria (610–619), defending the liturgy against heretical intrusion was one of the major tasks for a bishop. One of John's major accomplishments during his time as bishop was to suppress the use of the addition to the Trisagion associated

¹³⁵ John Moschos, *Spiritual Meadow*, PG, lxxxvii, 2877B–D, 2880A.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 2904A–B.

¹³⁷ Ibid., 2904C–D, 2905A.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 3065C–D, 3068A.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 2876C–2877A.

¹⁴⁰ *Anastasii Sinaitae Quaestiones et responsiones*, 114–15.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 114–15.

¹⁴² Ibid., 114–15.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 114–15.

with the Monophysites ("he who was crucified for us").¹⁴⁴ Seventy churches in Alexandria previously celebrated Mass using the heretical addition, but at the end of his reign only seven did. John forbade heretics from taking Communion at orthodox liturgies, something he compared to sexual sin.¹⁴⁵

The opponents of Monoenergism and Monotheletism accused their defenders of dividing up Jesus into several different persons by energies and wills.¹⁴⁶ The author of the *Testimonia et Syllogismi* challenged the people who expounded these beliefs or those in communion with them, who were assumed to have the same beliefs, to clarify them.¹⁴⁷ They were mockingly asked in which of the Jesuses they were created and baptized, or whose body and blood they distributed and ate. Christians could not allow impious statements from heretics to stand or to remain in communion with those who invented new doctrines like these.¹⁴⁸ It was believed that Maximus and his companions were martyred in part because of their reluctance to remain in communion with someone who espoused incorrect doctrine like Monotheletism.¹⁴⁹

Isidore's encyclopedic classification of heretics provides a sense of how heterodox belief combined with and contributed to false worship. Isidore reported on, or in all likelihood concocted, numerous heretical groups. So, for instance, the Adamites imitated Adam's nakedness and worshipped naked.¹⁵⁰ The Cainites had an improper focus for their worship: they worshipped the Biblically cursed Cain.¹⁵¹ The Angelics, as their name would imply, worshipped angels.¹⁵² For still other groups, the problem in their worship had to do with offering substances other than bread and wine mixed with water at Mass. The Artotyrites offered bread and cheese.¹⁵³ The Aquarians, rather than offering both wine and water mixed together, only poured water into their chalice.¹⁵⁴

¹⁴⁴ "Une vie inédite de Saint Jean l'Aumônier," 21; "Un épitomé inédit de la vie de S. Jean l'Aumônier," 274–5.

¹⁴⁵ Leontios of Neapolis, *Vie de Syméon le Fou; Vie de Jean de Chypre*, 398–9.

¹⁴⁶ *Testimonia et Syllogismi*, ed. and trans. in B. Neil, *Seventh-century Popes and Martyrs: The Political Hagiography of Anastasius Bibliothecarius* (Turnhout and NSW, Australia, 2006), 298–9.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 298–301.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 302–3.

¹⁴⁹ *Hypomnesticum*, ed. and trans. in Neil, *Seventh-century Popes and Martyrs*, 236–7.

¹⁵⁰ Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, ed. W.M. Lindsay, 2 vols (Oxford, 1911), i, 310. For the translations of all the unusual heretical groups, I depend upon *Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, trans. S.A. Barney et al. (Cambridge and New York, 2006), 175–8.

¹⁵¹ Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, i, 310.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, i, 310.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, i, 310.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, i, 310.

Finally, the Arians did not make any offerings on behalf of the deceased.¹⁵⁵ It is impossible to determine if this sordid list of heretics reflected reality, or perhaps only reported on groups that had existed in the past. What is important is the close association Isidore makes among incorrect belief, practice, and lack of unity in the Church.

While heresy was distinguished by distinctive liturgical practice and heretical beliefs that made it impossible to commune with the orthodox, liturgy also provided the resources to battle against heresy. As already examined, heretics could join the orthodox Church by being anointed, having hands laid on them, or professing their faith. A Severan Stylite saw a miracle performed by the orthodox patriarch of Antioch Ephraim, rejected his heresy, and then took consecrated bread from Ephraim's hands.¹⁵⁶ Isidore of Seville thought that the Nicene Creed chanted during the Mass in Spain was comprehensive enough to respond to nearly every heresy,¹⁵⁷ though it did not mention the many heresies that had grown up since the fourth century. Some of the means of combating heresy could be more colorful. The Chronicle of Theophanes claims that Pope Theodore I (642–649) used consecrated wine to write against the Monothelete patriarch of Constantinople, Pyrros, and people who took Communion with him. He dripped Eucharistic blood into his ink and used this “consecrated” ink to write out the condemnation.¹⁵⁸

Gregory I held out hope for the return of heretics to the orthodox faith. Since those outside the Church could not sacrifice, they were dependent upon members of the Church to offer sacrifices on their behalf.¹⁵⁹ The sacrifices carried out by the Church cleansed heretics from their pride so they might be reformed through grace.¹⁶⁰ Through grace, heretics could return to the unity of the Church,¹⁶¹ and then they would be able to gain salvation in the Church.¹⁶² In this scenario, the Church became the mediator of the liturgy between God and heretics.

This view shaped Gregory's interpretation of the Biblical Book of Job. For Gregory, Job's friends were heretics who returned to the Church.¹⁶³ Despite a desire to come back to the Church, they needed the intercession of Job to be able

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., i, 312.

¹⁵⁶ John Moschos, *Spiritual Meadow*, PG, lxxxvii, 2884C–2885C.

¹⁵⁷ Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, 18.

¹⁵⁸ Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1883), i, 331; *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, AD 284–813*, trans. and commentary C. Mango and R. Scott (Oxford and New York, 1997), 462.

¹⁵⁹ Gregory I, *Moralia in Job*, i, 21–2; iii, 1781, 1785–6.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., iii, 1782–3.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., iii, 1147–8.

¹⁶² Ibid., iii, 1781.

¹⁶³ Ibid., i, 21–2.

to perform a sacrifice: sacrifices of heretics were not acceptable to God.¹⁶⁴ The only thing that staved off the friends' punishment for their guilt was that God commanded them to do sacrifice,¹⁶⁵ which had to be offered by Job.¹⁶⁶ Since Job symbolized the Church, he offered sacrifices for his friends.¹⁶⁷ This only worked for people outside of the Church: someone like Elihu who was faithful yet proud would not be reconciled by sacrifice.¹⁶⁸

Reincorporation of people into the Church, however, raised certain questions. Whereas heretics were immediately restored to communion when they converted to orthodoxy, those who committed sexual sins were temporarily barred from the Eucharist.¹⁶⁹ Anastasius justified this controversial difference in punishment by arguing that heresy was done through ignorance, which was not true of voluntary sexual sin.¹⁷⁰ Second, the immediate forgiveness would make heretics eager to convert, whereas the separation from the Eucharist would make those who sin sexually less likely to continue.¹⁷¹

Drawing upon the resources of the liturgy to combat heresy could backfire badly, particularly when the heretics were unwilling participants. After the Montanists were forcibly baptized into the orthodox church, they refused to change their liturgical stripes and instead decided to commit suicide. They practiced divination to determine the correct day and then set fire to their churches, referred to as "houses appointed for their false worship."¹⁷²

Challenging Jewish Worship

The battle against improper worship further extended to the Jewish population. In Arator's sixth-century poem on the Apostles, he described a failed attempt by Jews to perform an exorcism in the name of Christ.¹⁷³ The implication of the story is that only exorcisms by Christians could hope to succeed. Much like the

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., i, 21–2.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., i, 129–30.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., iii, 1781.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., iii, 1781.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., iii, 1148–9.

¹⁶⁹ *Anastasii Sinaitae Quaestiones et responsiones*, 20–21.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 20–21.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., 20–21.

¹⁷² Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia*, i, 401; *Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor*, 554–5. I borrow the translation from the latter.

¹⁷³ Arator, *Historia apostolica*, ed. A.P. Orbán, CCSL, 130–130A (Turnhout, 2006), ii, 353–5, lines 641–67. This account is taken from Acts 19:14–18.

Montanists, some Jews were forcibly baptized.¹⁷⁴ Rather than take issue with this action, the Chronicle of Theophanes criticized the newly baptized, who after their unplanned initiation took Communion without having fasted in preparation!¹⁷⁵ Jews could also infect others. A Christian woman who married an unbaptized Jew would herself be excommunicated.¹⁷⁶

Gregory I stood up for certain Jewish rights, but his letters reveal that not everyone shared his respect for Judaism or its worship. He protested, for instance, that Jews in Terracina had repeatedly been driven out from their places of worship with the consent of the bishop, Peter.¹⁷⁷ Gregory issued a similar letter to Bishop Pascanius of Naples, to voice his opposition to the disruption of the Jews' festivals there.¹⁷⁸ If the ceremonies of Jews could be heard in a nearby church, Jews could be given a new house of worship; but the group was not to be oppressed.¹⁷⁹ Synagogues were not to be forcibly converted to churches.¹⁸⁰ Nor were Christian items like icons of Mary or crosses to be placed inside synagogues, as some Christians did in Cagliari.¹⁸¹ Gregory was not against the conversion of Jews, but felt that it should be done through kindness rather than violence.¹⁸² He was to reiterate this advice to the bishops of Arles and Marseilles, admonishing them to stop baptism by force and instead convince people to accept baptism by sweetness,¹⁸³ or to give them the financial incentive of tax breaks.¹⁸⁴ Special liturgical concessions could be made for Jews who were willing to convert. If there were Jews who were anxious to become Christians – as some Jews in Agrigento seemed to be – it was allowable to baptize them even outside of the Easter Vigil, so that the long delay would not cause them to change their minds or so that the end of the world would not arrive first.¹⁸⁵

There were limits, however, to the extent that Jews were allowed to become involved with Christian liturgy. In a letter to Libertinus, the praetor of Sicily, Gregory I complained that certain Jews had built an altar in the name of St Helias,

¹⁷⁴ Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia*, i, 401; *Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor*, 554–5.

¹⁷⁵ Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia*, i, 401; *Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor*, 554–5.

¹⁷⁶ Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Legum Sectio III, Concilia aevi Karolini, ed. A. Werminghoff (Hanover, 1906–1908), i, 8–32, at 16.

¹⁷⁷ Gregory I, *Registrum*, i, 42.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., ii, 1013–14.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., i, 137.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., ii, 546–7.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., ii, 750–52.

¹⁸² Ibid., ii, 1013–14.

¹⁸³ Ibid., i, 59.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., i, 273.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., ii, 543–4.

and were making a profit from it, seemingly through Christian donations.¹⁸⁶ Gregory thought of this as a form of seduction under false pretenses, which called for corporal punishment.

Liturgy against Pagans and Magicians

Whereas Judaism would find a moderate defender in the person of Gregory I, those suspected of any kind of magic or paganism were unambiguously condemned or even killed.¹⁸⁷ There were many things that could be classified as magical or pagan, and all were viewed negatively by the orthodox sources that report them: sorcery and dark rituals; sacrifice; oaths; worshipping improper things like the sun, idols, and demons; trying to tell the future; and interfering with appropriate liturgy. These ideals would be broadcast and condemned to such an extent that Boniface would draw upon them to criticize the papacy. Yet the resources of the liturgy could also be summoned to fight against magical or pagan practice and to convert sorcerers and pagans to Christianity.

As far as the popes were concerned, pagans were supposed to convert and cease doing anything associated with paganism or magic, however vaguely defined many of these unacceptable rituals were. This battle was already underway by the mid-fifth century, when Pope Leo I complained that certain people were standing on the steps of San Pietro in Vaticano to worship the sun.¹⁸⁸ But paganism would remain a recurrent problem for centuries. Gregory I encouraged the bishop of Aleria in Corsica to ensure that Christians did not slide back into paganism.¹⁸⁹ He also warned Agnellus, the bishop of Terracina, against the threat of pagan practice,¹⁹⁰ and ordered further investigation of a form of magic known by the ambiguous vernacular term *canterma*.¹⁹¹ For Gregory, the battle against paganism was critical because he believed the end of the world was not far removed and it was important that people remained Christian for judgment.¹⁹² Gregory II voiced similar concern about the baptism of pagans to the missionary Boniface.¹⁹³

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., i, 182–3.

¹⁸⁷ For overviews of medieval magic, see R. Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge and New York, 1989); and (specifically for the early Middle Ages), V.I.J. Flint, *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe* (Princeton, NJ, 1991).

¹⁸⁸ Leo I, *PL*, liv, 198B–199A (sermon 22.6) and *PL*, liv, 218C–219A (sermon 27.4).

¹⁸⁹ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 513–14.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., ii, 539.

¹⁹¹ Gregory I, *Registrum*, i, 299–300; B. Filotas, *Pagan Survivals, Superstitions and Popular Cultures in Early Medieval Pastoral Literature* (Toronto, 2005), 295.

¹⁹² Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 513–14, 827–8.

¹⁹³ *Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, 30–31.

Magicians and their books were to be dealt with harshly when they were apprehended. In Arator's poem, he recounted with approval the burning of grimoires in Ephesus.¹⁹⁴ In one of Gregory's tales in his *Dialogues*, a magician named Basilius was burned by the people of Rome.¹⁹⁵ Trumped-up charges of magic and fortune-telling were brought against a failed aspirant for the papacy, Paschal.¹⁹⁶ As a result, Paschal was degraded from the position of archdeacon and confined to a monastery.

The extant detail on magical or pagan practice in this period is limited. The Council in Trullo forbade pagan oaths, without clarifying what exactly these were and how they differed from Christian oaths.¹⁹⁷ Gregory I reported with unalloyed horror that the Lombards burned the head of a goat for the devil and danced around it in a circle, delivering an incantation.¹⁹⁸ Whether or not the Lombards were still carrying out such rituals in the early-seventh century is impossible to verify, and he might have manufactured this tale in order to depict the Lombards as irreligious and savage. Certain Christians wore protective amulets.¹⁹⁹ Some Germanic priests engaged in ritual functions of paganism. Letters referred to priests' sacrificing bulls and goats on behalf of the dead and their eating the offerings.²⁰⁰ Gregory III was careful to distinguish that offering for the dead was a legitimate practice, but it was allowed only when a priest remembered the Christian dead in his prayers.²⁰¹ It was not licit to eat meat that had been used as part of sacrificial offerings.²⁰²

Other people adopted objectionable foci of worship, such as idols or demons. Gregory I criticized nobles and landowners in Sardinia for not being able to stamp out pagan practices like idolatry.²⁰³ He sent a similar letter to the Augusta Constantina that mentioned sacrifices to idols in Corsica.²⁰⁴ In another case, Gregory I heard of a priest named Sissinus of Reggio who needed to be disciplined on charges of idolatry.²⁰⁵ Gregory warned the bishop of Sardinia,

¹⁹⁴ Arator, *Historia apostolica*, ii, 355–7, lines 668–87. This account is taken from Acts 19:19–20.

¹⁹⁵ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, ii, 38, 42.

¹⁹⁶ LP (Mommsen), 211.

¹⁹⁷ *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 173–4.

¹⁹⁸ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, iii, 374.

¹⁹⁹ PL, lxvii, 341–6, at 343. For this interpretation of *phylacterium*, see D.C. Skemer, *Binding Words: Textual Amulets in the Middle Ages* (University Park, PA, 2006), 10–12. The punishment for using them was excommunication.

²⁰⁰ *Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, 70–71, 174–7.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 50–51.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, 46.

²⁰³ Gregory I, *Registrum*, i, 241–2.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, i, 312–14.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, ii, 827–8.

Januarius, to be on guard against those who worshipped idols or made use of fortune-tellers.²⁰⁶ Gregory III called for the people of Germany to abandon the worship of idols and pagan gods (that he cast as demons) and instead to direct prayer to God.²⁰⁷ One of the charges against the renegade priests Aldebert and Clement, who were condemned at Boniface's suggestion at the Roman synod of 745, was that they said a sacrilegious prayer that supposedly invoked angels, but actually named demons.²⁰⁸

As previously seen in Gregory's letter to Januarius,²⁰⁹ the attempt to divine the future was also criticized. The Council in Trullo strove to eliminate fortune-tellers and magicians, whose practice was called pagan. Its canons prohibited attending shows with diviners, sorcerers, and bear trainers.²¹⁰ These were explicitly referred to as pagan activities. The Council of 721 threatened anyone who consulted with diviners or magicians.²¹¹ In one letter, Gregory I both praised his notary Hadrian for his campaign against magicians and fortune-tellers and then criticized him for believing that these same people had the power to trick Gregory into opposing Hadrian's mission!²¹²

Not every commentator, however, was adamantly set against all forms of divination. Faced with the issue of whether or not a Christian may consult the Bible as an oracle, Anastasius of Sinai offered a typically measured response.²¹³ He was hardly enthusiastic about this practice, noting that he could find no positive evidence to recommend it, and he further suggested that in some instances God hindered those telling the future with the Bible.²¹⁴ According to him, the practice only started so that the faithful would not go to fortune-tellers or sorcerers – in essence, to remove the competition – not because it had any positive value in and of itself.²¹⁵ Despite the negative tone of these comments, Anastasius still allowed the consultation of the Bible to tell the future and described the correct process to do it: first pray to God on the matter, and only if God orders the supplicant to open the Bible should he do so.²¹⁶ In another answer, Anastasius mentioned that this method could be used to find out if a

²⁰⁶ Ibid., ii, 763–5.

²⁰⁷ *Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, 35–6.

²⁰⁸ *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Legum Sectio III, Concilia aevi Karolini*, ed. A. Werminghoff (Hanover, 1906–1908), i, 37–44, at 42–3; *Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, 117–18.

²⁰⁹ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 763–5.

²¹⁰ *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 140–42.

²¹¹ *PL*, lxxvii, 341–6, at 343.

²¹² Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 921.

²¹³ *Anastasii Sinaitae Quaestiones et responsiones*, 108–9.

²¹⁴ Ibid., 108–9.

²¹⁵ Ibid., 108–9.

²¹⁶ Ibid., 108–9.

prayer was God's will.²¹⁷ This response did not disguise Anastasius' distancing himself from attempts to learn the future, but it did not forbid one from doing so either. Ultimately, Anastasius left the decision up to God, who must respond positively to allow the request to proceed.

Finally, using incorrect ritual disrupted legitimate ritual. Only Catholic bishops were able to fight against the powers of demons. In one of Gregory's stories, a woman who was possessed by demons had those demons multiply when sorcerers attempted to exorcise them.²¹⁸ Only the orthodox Bishop Fortunatus was able to exorcise a possessed woman. In the mid-eighth century, the heretic Adelbert set up his own oratories in competition with more established churches and clergy, and began offering public prayers in them.²¹⁹ People began to treat Adelbert like a living saint, believing his prayers could help them and preserving his hair and nails as relics. The Roman Council of 745 disciplined him for flaunting his authority and leading the faithful astray.

Christianity was to assume such a dominant position in the public sphere of Rome that any perceived violation of that space was open to controversy, even by those outside the city. Boniface wrote to the pope about the ostensibly pagan festivals carried out near San Pietro in Vaticano in Rome on 1 January. Although Boniface was attached to Roman belief and practice, he took issue with the celebrations that occurred there; he enumerated, for instance, the chanting of sacrilegious songs, the selling of amulets and bracelets by women, and an uncharitable unwillingness to lend out anything like fire or tools to neighbors.²²⁰ Boniface further cited from Augustine, in which the list of possible sacrilegious rites was expanded to include incantations, diviners, and illegitimate prophecies. Boniface was forthright in his criticism because he was concerned that knowledge of these Roman rituals was spreading to Germany and endangering his own mission. According to Boniface, his new converts complained that they were prohibited from behaviors allowed in Rome. The rituals were hindering Boniface's preaching to instruct new people into the faith. He concluded that forbidding such practices in the eternal city would also be a benefit to Rome as well. Boniface was so zealous for the monopolization of the public space by orthodox Christianity that he wanted to remove any vestiges of paganism. He

²¹⁷ Ibid., 152–3.

²¹⁸ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, ii, 94, 96.

²¹⁹ Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Legum Sectio III, Concilia aevi Karolini, ed. A. Werminghoff (Hanover, 1906–1908), i, 37–44, at 39–40. Adelbert is only charged with “celebrating” public prayers (*publicas orationes celebrare*), but not the Mass; since the latter was a more serious charge, it would have been mentioned if suspected. For Adelbert, see J.B. Russell, *Dissent and Reform in the Early Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1965), 102–7.

²²⁰ *Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, 84–5. For a discussion of this letter, see Filotas, *Pagan Survivals*, 164.

was willing to challenge the source of Roman liturgy, the pope, to ensure proper worship was maintained and paganism defeated.

In response to Boniface's letter, Pope Zachary did not deny that such practices existed, but clarified the papacy's position on them.²²¹ Zachary claimed that, in line with the teaching of the Apostles, his predecessors and he had more than once forbidden any of the New Year's practices Boniface listed, including festivities, auguries, amulets, and incantations. Zachary identified the root cause of these problems as the devil. Zachary also reiterated Boniface's mission to teach and save people, perhaps redirecting his energies away from taking issue with how the pope disciplined his flock.

Christian liturgy provided the resources to convert pagans and work against their ritual. Exorcism to drive out the devil and demonic influences was part of the baptismal ceremony.²²² Pope Victor allowed any pagan converting to Christianity to be baptized wherever he was, including at natural bodies of water, so long as he confessed the faith.²²³ Part of the fight against paganism was taking over the spaces that had previously been pagan temples. The conversion of the Pantheon to a church involved stripping it of idols, representative of the old worship of demons – that is the former pagan gods – and creating a memorial to the saints.²²⁴

Conversion of pagans and curtailing their worship was no easy task. This becomes clearest in a letter Gregory I composed to a Frankish abbot named Mellitus.²²⁵ He urged the abbot to take small steps to transform the worship of the people from pagan gods to the true God. He was to destroy the idols inside temples, but not the temples themselves, which could be consecrated with holy water; and altars, which could be provided with relics. Pagans should be allowed to continue their customary sacrifice of animals, but should now direct praise to God rather than demons as they killed them. This would be similar to what God allowed in the case of Israel in the Old Testament. Since the Israelites had carnal and ignorant minds, they could only advance through a progressive course of preaching.²²⁶ In the beginning they would believe in fear, and in time would graduate to the freedom of the Spirit.²²⁷ What this meant in concrete terms is that God prohibited from engaging in certain pagan, Egyptian practices like

²²¹ *Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, 90–91.

²²² OR XI: 5, 21 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 419, 422–3). For this feature of baptism, see H.A. Kelly, *The Devil at Baptism: Ritual, Theology, and Drama* (Ithaca, NY, 1985), esp. 201–31.

²²³ LP (Mommsen), 18.

²²⁴ Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, 128. Cf. the brief account (with no reference to idols) in LP (Mommsen), 165.

²²⁵ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 961–2.

²²⁶ Gregory I, *Moralia in Job*, iii, 1426–8.

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, iii, 1426–8.

sacrificing animals to idols.²²⁸ He weaned them away from worshipping idols by allowing them to continue animal sacrifices, as long as those sacrifices were directed to God and not to demons.²²⁹ The rationale was that gradually their hearts would be changed even as they did the same external ritual. At the same time, some of the Israelites' worship traditions prefigured the coming of Jesus and Christianity.²³⁰ So the same sacrifices of animals were an allegory of the death of Jesus and the extinction of the carnal life.²³¹

Conclusion

What emerges from this chapter is that the pope and other members of the clergy sought to map out the boundaries of a new world formed through orthodox Christian liturgy. Much of their energy was expended on regulating the shape of orthodox liturgy. Combined with the effort to forge unity of those who belonged to their community was defining which ritual practices lay outside mainstream Christian society and combating them. Accepting papal and, more generally, clerical authority meant excluding those who deviated from it and eliminating unacceptable ritual. Those targeted ranged from orthodox Christians who strayed in some respect to a host of others, whether it be heretics, Jews, pagans, or magicians. In some cases, honest heretics and schismatics may have willingly excluded themselves from a society dominated by the pope and his clergy in order to carry out their distinctive worship and live in peace. As a whole, this program represented an endeavor by the clergy to reform the ritual of society and remake society in its image.

It is difficult to determine from prescriptive documents the extent to which this campaign was successful. As so many documents that issue from the clergy, the sources are better at reporting a vision of how the clergy wanted reality to be than how it really was. Gregory I would not have had to send so many letters if the liturgical norms he cherished were universally respected! Clearly, the laity was not always obedient, and likely they pushed back against clerical norms more often than can be observed. At least in some of the instances discussed here, the laity used the symbolic understanding of the liturgy and the bonds it created against the clergy.

Yet as the period under study here progressed there was likely less room to maneuver for rebellious laity. The pope and the clergy in the Mediterranean had grown ever more powerful, and would be able to implement many of their

²²⁸ Ibid., iii, 1426–8.

²²⁹ Ibid., iii, 1426–8.

²³⁰ Ibid., iii, 1426–8.

²³¹ Ibid., iii, 1426–8.

ideals. Especially in the city of Rome, the clergy faced little real competition for power in society and might well have been able to exalt their form of Christian worship and push violators out of the mainstream. Their admonitions and cautionary tales would have supported their ideals. Above all, bishops could impose excommunication, which threatened a Christian's standing in this life and the next. Likely the risks of social exclusion and damnation helped to fight against opponents of the new liturgical order. In some cases, there were real repercussions for those who violated this order. Excluding other forms of liturgy gave popes and other clergy firmer control over spiritual power and allowed them to summon it to pray for their flock in a new way.

This page has been left blank intentionally

Chapter 5

Prayer in Roman Society

Introduction

Prayer was omnipresent in medieval society and is one of the most recurrent features of contemporary sources. It is curious, then, that the topic has been so little studied for Rome in the seventh and eighth centuries. If pressed, many scholars would assume that prayer was a pious business that persisted unchanged for centuries and had no broader effect on society. When historians investigate prayer in the early Middle Ages, they focus on the monastery and generally describe prayer as an exchange of pious donations for the health of people's souls.¹ Scholarship has also grown up around confraternities of prayer stemming from monasteries.² Much of the work on medieval prayer, even very good contributions, tends to verge towards theology rather than practice, and rarely combine the two.³ The chronology of prayer is sometimes vague; spirituality is the main focus and more mundane concerns or events related to prayer tend to be downplayed. Other works give the textual history of prayer without any idea of a prayer's societal significance.⁴ In some cases, the books that contain prayers are

¹ For example, M. de Jong, "Carolingian Monasticism: The Power of Prayer," in *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Volume 2, c.700–c.900*, ed. R. McKitterick (Cambridge, 1995), 622–53, at 647–51.

² *Memoria: der geschichtliche Zeugniswert des liturgischen Gedenkens im Mittelalter*, ed. K. Schmid and J. Wollasch (Munich, 1984); W.E. Wagner, *Die liturgische Gegenwart des abwesenden Königs: Gebetsverbrüderung und Herrscherbild im frühen Mittelalter* (Leiden and Boston, 2010).

³ See J. Châtillon, "Prière au Moyen Age," in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique: doctrine et histoire*, 17 vols (Paris, 1986), xii, part 2, 2271–88; *A History of Prayer: The First to the Fifteenth Century*, ed. R. Hammerling (Leiden and Boston, 2008); J. Longère, "Prayer," in *Encyclopedia of the Middle Ages*, ed. A. Vauchez, 2 vols (Chicago, 2000), ii, 1178; *Prier au Moyen Age: pratiques et expériences (Ve–XVe siècles)*, ed. N. Bériou, J. Berlioz, and J. Longère (Turnhout, 1991); D.A. Rivard, *Blessing the World: Ritual and Lay Piety in Medieval Religion* (Washington, DC, 2009).

⁴ B.D. Spinks, *The Sanctus in the Eucharistic Prayer* (Cambridge and New York, 1991).

better studied than the prayers themselves.⁵ Few scholars give a contextualized, historical account of how prayer “worked” in a particular time and place.⁶

In this chapter I intend to define the position prayer held in the society of seventh- and eighth-century Rome, a role that I will argue is more central and pervasive than previously recognized. Implicit in my discussion is the idea that the text of the orations, when properly understood and discussed in the context of contemporary accounts, can be valuable sources in reconstructing the history of prayer. Because the primary interest of this study is in the liturgy, I will largely confine my discussion to public rather than private devotional prayer, although the sources do not always recognize this distinction. Gregory I (590–604), for instance, saw every prayer as a form of sacrificing or offering as in the Mass, only on the altar of the heart.⁷ Further, one study has shown that private prayer often borrows its content from the liturgy.⁸

I will start by examining the two figures in this period who can reasonably be described as theoreticians of prayer, Gregory I and Isidore of Seville (d. 636), and then turn to contemporary sources to get a more concrete sense of how prayer operated in this society. Although, at least in theory, what one might request in prayer is unlimited, it will prove useful to organize the benefits received from prayer into two analytical categories that medieval Romans themselves would have recognized: the temporal and the spiritual. The first category applies to the things one could attain on earth, whereas the second relates to God and heaven. As will become clear, this construct is not entirely satisfactory, because where prayer is concerned, the spiritual and temporal collapse into one another. In fact, I will argue that prayer ultimately eliminated any dichotomy between heaven and earth. In the last section of this chapter, I will address a modern debate involving prayer in early medieval society. While at least in part a kind of commerce between humans and God, this exchange is more complex than it first appears. It also created a web of human and divine relationships.

Previous studies on Roman prayer have been frustrated by their lack of hard chronological markers. Although Roman prayers that have been transmitted to us have few indications of specific people or events, they must originally have been tailored to some degree to respond to contemporary situations. At least

⁵ For example, E. Duffy, *Marking the Hours: English People and their Prayers* (New Haven and London, 2006) for Books of Hours; R. Trexler, *The Christian at Prayer: An Illustrated Prayer Manual Attributed to Peter the Chanter (d. 1197)* (Binghamton, NY, 1987).

⁶ Though see M. McLaughlin, *Consorting with Saints: Prayer for the Dead in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1994); S. Boynton, *Shaping a Monastic Identity: Liturgy & History at the Imperial Abbey of Farfa, 1000–1125* (Ithaca, NY, 2006).

⁷ Gregory I, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, ed. R. Etaix, CCSL, 141 (Turnhout, 1999), 70 (sermon 10).

⁸ A. Wilmart, *Auteurs spirituels et textes dévots du Moyen Age latin: études d'histoire littéraire* (Paris, 1932), 13–25.

one regular form of modification is well established: the name of the current pope was mentioned during the Canon,⁹ as were the names of laity who had donated bread and wine.¹⁰ Some scholars attempted to associate prayers with authors or historical circumstances, and by this method, to date them. Certain prayers in the Roman sacramentaries have been linked with the struggles Rome faced in the sixth and seventh centuries,¹¹ such as the siege of Rome in 537–538 by the Ostrogothic King Vitiges¹² and the looming threat of a Lombard invasion under Gregory I.¹³ Both cases demonstrated the similarity between prayers in sacramentaries (the so-called “Leonine” Sacramentary or Verona Collection in the former case and the Gregorian in the latter) and contemporary papal language. In addition, scholars tried to synchronize the content in the prayers with the trying historical circumstances in Rome. Though the arguments they make are plausible, they are unlikely to convince everyone. Certain methodological difficulties make it impossible to confirm their findings. Associating undated prayers with supposed authors is a perilous endeavor. The style of composition of the pope and papal notaries must have been influenced by the prayers they heard on a regular basis, making it possible that an existing prayer inspired the style of papal compositions, rather than both being written at the same time by the same person. These prayers also do not specify the particular crises to which they were responding. If these details were a part of the original prayers, either written or improvised when they were spoken, they were scrubbed out before inclusion in prayer books. One could just as easily argue that there was a stereotypical language of prayer repeated throughout the centuries and exploited for a host of different disasters.

The conclusion one may draw from these methodological difficulties is to avoid making historical arguments from liturgical formulae at all, which is what Edmund Bishop cautioned.¹⁴ Yet I think prayers can be a valuable source, if used for a different kind of inquiry. Rather than endeavor to date the prayers more precisely, I will instead employ a twofold strategy to analyze their content. First, I will discuss the body of prayers that was extant in the seventh and eighth centuries regardless of their original date of composition. No one denies that

⁹ In the *Te igitur: L'ordinaire*, 74, 76. Outside of Rome, the pope and local bishop would both be named.

¹⁰ In the *Memento: L'ordinaire*, 76.

¹¹ G.G. Willis, *Further Essays in Early Roman Liturgy* (London, 1968), 78–9.

¹² A. Chavasse, “Messés du pape Vigile (537–555) dans le sacramentaire léonien,” *EpheMERIDES liturgicae*, 64 (1950), 161–213 and 66 (1952), 145–219.

¹³ H. Ashworth, “The Influence of the Lombard Invasions on the Gregorian Sacramentary,” *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 36 (1953–1954), 305–27.

¹⁴ E. Bishop, *Liturgica Historica: Papers on the Liturgy and Religious Life of the Western Church* (Oxford, 1918), 298.

prayers were used in public liturgies and played an important part in the Mass.¹⁵ Seeing as this is the case, the body of prayers would shape the mentalities of Romans.¹⁶ Romans were likely to have believed in the power ascribed to the orations, or else there would have been no point in delivering them. Second, I will draw upon narrative and theological sources that confirm and elaborate on what prayers accomplished in the world.

Theories of Prayer

It will be useful at the beginning of this investigation to examine how contemporaries viewed prayer. One of the most eloquent witnesses to prayer in Roman society comes from the pen of Gregory I, who had no doubt about the power of true prayer.¹⁷ In a sermon that he delivered in the church of San Pancrazio on the celebration of this martyr's death in 591, Gregory described Romans' performance of prayer, while taking issue with aspects of it:

Look – we see, beloved brothers, how many assembled for the solemnity of the martyr, you bend your knees, you strike your breast, you lift up voices of prayer and thanksgiving, you moisten your face with tears. But think, I ask, of your petitions; see if you ask in the name of Jesus, that is if you request the joys of eternal salvation. In the house of Jesus you do not seek Jesus, if in the temple of eternity you unsuitably pray for temporal things. See – one seeks a wife in prayer, another asks for an estate, another requests clothing, another prays that food be given to him. And indeed when these things are lacking, they should be requested from almighty God. But we should constantly remember what we received from the command of our Redeemer: *Seek first the kingdom of God and his justice, and all these things will be added to you*. And one does not go astray in asking for these things from Jesus if, however, one does not ask for too much. But what is yet more serious, another requests the death of an enemy and he who cannot be attacked by the sword is attacked by prayer ... However, God commands that an enemy be loved.¹⁸

¹⁵ The major prayers of the Mass are the collect before the readings (OR I:53), the prayer over the offerings (*Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 86 [formula 2]), the Canon (OR I:88–95), and the final prayer (OR I:123). In addition to these, the pope also engaged in private prayer before ascending to the altar (OR I:50).

¹⁶ For a study of the ways that prayer influenced the writing of history, see L. Arbusow, *Liturgie und Geschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter* (Bonn, 1951). For a previous study that used prayer to describe mentalities, see J. Van Engen, “Christening the Romans,” *Traditio*, 52 (1997), 1–45, at 23–44.

¹⁷ Gregory I, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, 236 (sermon 27).

¹⁸ Gregory I, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, 235 (sermon 27): “Ecce uidemus, fratres carissimi, quam multi ad sollemnitatem martyris conuenistis, genua flectitis, pectus tunditis, uoces

Gregory affirmed the significance of prayer for his listeners, and depicted how elaborate and physical displays in prayer were: people got down on their knees, struck their chests, and cried. Viewing this kind of performance as unremarkable, he turned his attention to the objectionable component of their prayer: what people asked for. Gregory exhorted the congregation to seek higher spiritual goals, stressing that they seek Jesus through prayer, rather than the mundane things people typically requested. What one could receive through prayer was malleable, ranging across any one of people's mundane desires: to find a wife, an estate, clothing, or food. Prayer had such tremendous efficacy that it could kill an enemy, a practice that Gregory acknowledged but admonished against.

Gregory's interest in prayer extended beyond forbidding abuses of it. In his theological work, he endeavored to establish guidelines on how to pray. If he harbored doubts about average petitions, he had none about the significance of maintaining what might be referred to as a "prayer life"¹⁹ and being persistent in prayer.²⁰ Gregory placed importance on what was requested in prayer. God would only grant through prayer things he had already predestined to give, including salvation.²¹ Gregory argued that God should be the central object of prayer, and the main request be eternal rewards in heaven.²² Focusing on temporal, visible things would cause one to grow weary in prayer, and God might refuse to grant these petitions.²³ Someone who did not focus on God and heaven would hold God in contempt.²⁴ One would not only be praying for improper things, but also be at odds with what the soul truly desires. The soul longs for heaven and

orationis ac confessionis emittitis, faciem lacrimis rigatis. Sed pensate, quaeso, petitiones uestras: uidete si in nomine Iesu petitis, id est si gaudia salutis aeternae postulatis. In domo enim Iesu Iesum non quaeritis, si in aeternitatis templo importune pro temporalibus oratis. Ecce alius in oratione quaerit uxorem, alius petit uillam, alius postulat uestem, alius dari sibi deprecatur alimentum. Et quidem cum haec desunt, ab omnipotenti Deo petenda sunt. Sed meminisse continue debemus quod ex mandato eiusdem nostri Redemptoris accepimus: *Quaerite primum regnum Dei et iustitiam eius, et haec omnia adicientur uobis* [Matthew 6:33; Luke 12:31]. Et haec itaque ab Iesu petere non est errare, si tamen non nimie petantur. Sed adhuc, quod est grauius, alius postulat mortem inimici, eumque quem gladio non potest persequi, persequitur oratione ... lubet autem Deus ut diligatur inimicus."

¹⁹ Gregory I, *Moralia in Job*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL, 143, 143A, 143B (Turnhout, 1979–1985), ii, 891.

²⁰ Gregory I, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, 15 (sermon 2).

²¹ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, ed. A. de Vogüé, trans. P. Antin, Sources chrétiennes, 251, 260, 265 (Paris, 1978–1980), ii, 70, 72, 74. For Gregory's inconsistent views on predestination, see F.H. Dudden, *Gregory the Great, His Place in History and Thought*, 2 vols (New York, 1967), ii, 400–402.

²² Gregory I, *Moralia in Job*, ii, 781–2.

²³ Ibid., ii, 781–2.

²⁴ Ibid., ii, 781–2.

God, its creator; it is united with things that are above and removed from things that are below.²⁵

Prayer had benefits even for the petitioner who prays on behalf of others. When one intercedes for others, his prayers become more powerful and he obtains much from God because of his love for his neighbor.²⁶ Someone who is penitent for his own sins will be heard more quickly and more willingly by God if he first has prayed for others.²⁷ Yet as Gregory would explain elsewhere, there remained significant limitations when it came to prayer for others. Normally it was worthwhile to pray for enemies in order to convert their hearts to penitence and save them.²⁸ Once someone was damned, however, there was no reason to pray for them, since all hope of salvation was gone.²⁹ Without the possibility of being saved, prayer loses all sense.

Gregory's ultimate reference point for proper behavior was the Bible. Moses and Samuel were praised for praying for their enemies.³⁰ Moses pleaded the cause of the people of Israel before God with prayers.³¹ The most perfect model of someone engaged in prayer was Jesus. Gregory interpreted the prayers mentioned in Job 16:18 as referring typologically to the pure prayers Jesus made to God during the Passion.³² Even in anguish, Jesus still prayed for his persecutors.³³ Gregory thought that there was no purer form of prayer than asking for intercession for those causing one pain.³⁴ Imitating Jesus by praying in this fashion would make people children of the Heavenly Father.³⁵

There was a high standard for offering up the most significant prayers, the prayers of the Canon. God would refuse a gift from a person with a wicked heart.³⁶ It was incumbent upon the person doing the offering to cleanse his soul first.³⁷ Only by wiping clean evil from one's soul and finding purity could he avert God's wrath.³⁸ To illustrate this point, Gregory again turned to Scripture. Gregory drew upon the example of Cain and Abel, which would have been familiar in Rome because of the fifth-century frescoes of this story in the nave of San Paolo

²⁵ Ibid., ii, 781–2.

²⁶ Ibid., iii, 1787.

²⁷ Ibid., iii, 1787.

²⁸ Ibid., iii, 1760–61.

²⁹ Ibid., iii, 1760–61.

³⁰ Gregory I, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, 236 (sermon 27).

³¹ Gregory I, *Moralia in Job*, ii, 1012–14.

³² Ibid., ii, 682.

³³ Ibid., ii, 682.

³⁴ Ibid., ii, 682.

³⁵ Ibid., ii, 823–4.

³⁶ Ibid., ii, 1112.

³⁷ Ibid., ii, 1112–13.

³⁸ Ibid., ii, 1112–13.

fuori le Mura.³⁹ Abel's gifts to God were pleasing, not because of the offerings themselves, but because of Abel's virtue.⁴⁰ The interior purity of the giver's heart is the deciding factor for whether God would accept a gift.⁴¹ Gregory's example would have reminded his audience of the sacrifice of the Mass.

Gregory realized that many would fail to live up to his ideal form of prayer life. According to him there were some in the Church who offered long prayers but did not act correctly.⁴² They sought after heaven with the promises of their prayers, but not in their deeds.⁴³ They sometimes cried in prayer, but afterwards fell prey to sin and forgot they had wept for desire of heaven.⁴⁴ If prayer did not correspond to correct action, Gregory had little use for it.⁴⁵ Genuine prayer involved groaning bitterly in compunction, not saying well-arranged words.⁴⁶

Gregory applied his ideas about prayer to his own life. He was convinced that prayers for others had power in the world, so much so that he requests the reader of *Moralia in Job* to pray for him.⁴⁷ These prayers would serve him before God, the strict Judge.⁴⁸ He considered it fair compensation for his work if the reader to whom he had given words would give Gregory tears in return.⁴⁹ Tears, an outward, physical sign of penitence for one's sins, could be effective in interceding for someone else's sin.

Requests for prayer were recurrent in Gregory's letters, though it is not always evident if liturgical prayer is implied. He asked Bishop John of Constantinople to pray for him in his tribulations, including the health problems he faced.⁵⁰ He sent a detailed prayer request to Sebastian, the bishop of Resini, in which he asked to be freed from his sins and enter heaven.⁵¹ He asked the metropolitan Domitian and a priest of Mount Sinai named Palladius to pray for him.⁵² Gregory also requested prayers from Elias, a priest and abbot of Isauria, whose son had been made a deacon in Rome.⁵³ Perhaps reflecting the holiness monks

³⁹ *Fragmenta Picta. Affreschi e mosaici staccati del Medioevo romano*, ed. M. Andaloro, A. Ghidoli, A. Iacobini, S. Romano, and A. Tomei (Rome, 1989), 372, 376.

⁴⁰ Gregory I, *Moralia in Job*, ii, 1112–13.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, ii, 1112–13.

⁴² *Ibid.*, iii, 1711–12.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, iii, 1711–12.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, iii, 1711–12.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, ii, 891.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, iii, 1711–12.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, iii, 1810–11.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, iii, 1810–11.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, iii, 1810–11.

⁵⁰ Gregory I, *Registrum*, i, 4–5.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, i, 318–20.

⁵² *Ibid.*, i, 211–13; ii, 857–9.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, i, 302–3.

had and the power of their prayers, Gregory asked him to pray for his absolution from sin and acceptance in heaven.⁵⁴ Gregory considered prayers more valuable than earthly goods. He objected to the gifts that Felix, the bishop of Messina, sent to him.⁵⁵ Gregory planned to sell the items and send the money back; he wanted prayers instead.

Isidore of Seville sought less to dictate how prayer ought to be undertaken and instead focused more single-mindedly on what prayer was capable of accomplishing. He envisioned prayer as a way to supplicate God and to drive out unnamed afflictions of the soul (*aegritudines animae*).⁵⁶ Isidore wrote at length on the most important prayers of the Mass, the Eucharistic prayers of the Canon. He carefully mapped out the different roles that each of the seven prayers of the Visigothic Canon played.⁵⁷ One incited people to entreat God; another served as an invocation to God to receive both the prayers and offering of the faithful; another made God show favor to those offering gifts or for the faithful departed; one reconciled people in love in preparation for the Kiss of Peace and the Eucharist; another blessed the offering; and another consecrated the Eucharist so that it took the form of the body and blood of Jesus. Although people could pray for consecration, it was ultimately the Holy Spirit's blessing that executed it.⁵⁸

Isidore also mapped out the role of prayers in the *Pater noster*, which contains a series of seven petitions to God, four of which are temporal and three of which are eternal.⁵⁹ The sanctification of God's name, the coming of his kingdom, and God's will being done could be requested on earth, but they could only be fulfilled in the next life. On the other hand, asking for daily bread, pardon from sin, not to be led into temptation, and to be delivered from evil would only hold meaning in the current earthly existence. The prayer as a whole contributed to salvation: Isidore referred to it as the hope of sinners, and cited Joel 2:32 to mean that all who invoke the name of God will be saved.⁶⁰

For Gregory, then, prayer was a font of enormous power, but it was difficult to do properly and effectively without allowing abuses to creep in. He recognized that people asked for mundane things for themselves but thought that they should pray for others and for salvation. Isidore concurred with the great spiritual power of prayer for the individual, for groups of people, and for

⁵⁴ For Gregory's devotion to monasticism, see J. Richards, *Consul of God: The Life and Times of Gregory the Great* (London and Boston, 1980), 32–7, 251–8.

⁵⁵ Gregory I, *Registrum*, i, 74.

⁵⁶ Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, ed. C.M. Lawson, CCL, 113 (Turnhout, 1989), 8.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 17–18.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 18.

people's relationship with God. It was a gateway for God's operation within the world and pointed to the more complete fulfillment of God's promises in eternal life.

Rewards of Prayer: Temporal Gifts

The thought of Gregory I and Isidore already started to specify the aims of prayer. But it will be worthwhile to classify and analyze more systematically what prayer could accomplish for early medieval Romans.

Prayers could deliver both temporal and spiritual rewards. For Gregory and the Romans in attendance at his sermon, prayer had the power to assist one in attaining many worldly goods. Roman prayers could be said for the benefit of someone starting out on a journey.⁶¹ The Greek euchologion or prayer book from this period provides a virtual laundry list of what prayer accomplished in this world. An oration could bless a house.⁶² Other prayers could create an engagement or marriage.⁶³ Prayers were said for the benefit of travelers⁶⁴ and those setting sail.⁶⁵ God could aid in the construction of a house.⁶⁶ A prayer could be used to purify someone or something: from a monk who had a nocturnal emission⁶⁷ to a well in which an animal fell and fouled the water.⁶⁸ Prayers were given over meals⁶⁹ and blessed the first fruits.⁷⁰ In the Roman tradition, beans and grapes could be blessed on the altar.⁷¹ The Council in Trullo (691–692) sought to bring an end to the custom of offering and blessing grapes in the course of the Mass, placing it outside of the context of public worship.⁷² In some narrative accounts, the effects of prayers devoted to minor matters can be seen. Nonnosus, a monk, was able to fix glass lamps through prayer.⁷³ With a blessing,

⁶¹ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 343 (formula 999).

⁶² *L'Eucologio Barberini Gr. 336*, ed. S. Parenti and E. Velkovska, 2nd edn (Rome, 2000), 184 (formula 183), 219 (formula 241, no. 2).

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 185 (formulae 184–5) for engagement; 185–8 (formulae 186–9) for marriage.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 189–90 (formula 192).

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 190 (formula 193).

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 214 (formula 232, no. 2).

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 216–17 (formula 237, no. 2).

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 217–18 (formula 238, no. 3).

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 189 (formulae 190–91).

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 184 (formula 182).

⁷¹ LP (Mommson), 38.

⁷² *The Council in Trullo Revisited*, ed. G. Nedungatt and M. Featherstone (Rome, 1995), 102–3.

⁷³ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, ii, 68.

Bishop Fortunatus was able to heal a Goth's horse.⁷⁴ Prayers for most mundane matters were not seen as appropriate or important enough for inclusion within the papal prayer book, and so they do not survive although they were surely circulating throughout Rome in this period.

The construction of a new church was replete with prayer and liturgical practices associated with it. A prayer was used to dedicate a church.⁷⁵ When Honorius built a basilica dedicated to St Apollinaris, he also instituted a litany with chanting that would proceed from this church to San Pietro in Vaticano.⁷⁶ Gregory I allowed a woman of Naples to build a monastery, and requested that Bishop Fortunatus ritually dedicate its church and provide priests to hold Masses there.⁷⁷ Prayer's essential role in the construction of churches was something indirectly acknowledged even by Emperor Justinian II (685–695, 705–711), who was not one to respect Roman liturgical customs.⁷⁸ Justinian II demanded that the patriarch of Constantinople, Kallinikos, say a prayer to allow him to demolish the church of the Mother of God *tōn metropolitou*; he planned to replace it with a new fountain and bench for him to receive one of the factions of the city.⁷⁹ There existed prayers to be said for erecting churches, but nothing for their destruction.⁸⁰ Even after the patriarch insisted that there was no such prayer, Justinian II was adamant that a blessing be said. Finally the patriarch improvised a prayer: "Glory be to God, the all-enduring, now and forever, and centuries without end. Amen."⁸¹ The formulation of this prayer is doubly ironic: first, because although God is eternal, clearly this church would not exist much longer; and second, in the sense that God endures – i.e. puts up with – all things, including the emperor's disregard for religion by tearing down a church for secular ends.

Prayer could also be directed against different tribulations.⁸² Prayer was directed against war, in favor of peace, or, more generally, for protection and

⁷⁴ Ibid., ii, 100.

⁷⁵ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 303 (formula 195).

⁷⁶ LP (Mommsen), 171–2.

⁷⁷ Gregory I, *Registrum*, i, 206–7.

⁷⁸ F. Görres, "Justinian II. und das römische Papsttum," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 17 (1908), 432–54; J. Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom* (Princeton, 1989), 284–6.

⁷⁹ Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1883), i, 367–8.

⁸⁰ V. Ruggieri, "Consacrazione e dedicazione di chiesa, secondo il Barberinianus graecus 336," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 54 (1988), 79–117, at 87.

⁸¹ *Theophanis Chronographia*, i, 368: "Doksa tō theō anechomenō tantote, nun kai aei kai eis tous aiōnas, tōn aiōnōn. Amēn." I am grateful to John Duffy for his help with translation of this passage.

⁸² *Antiphonale*, 206–7. The titles in the MSS of the antiphoner are different: MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 17436 has antiphons against whatever tribulation

defense. This type of prayer, especially with war, has been a subject of past research,⁸³ though not specifically focused on Rome. Prayers against war are found in the Gregorian Sacramentary, as music against war is found in the antiphoner.⁸⁴ At a Mass said in times of war, God is asked to provide a rest from wars⁸⁵ or to exult in the tranquility of times,⁸⁶ a prayer that necessitated that God first furnish the state of peace that was lacking. It is further requested that God grant peace,⁸⁷ or that God would allot our days in his peace.⁸⁸ God is asked to protect his people⁸⁹ or to give the help of his defense.⁹⁰ Some prayers specify that humans had to be defended because of their frailty.⁹¹ Theodore of Sykeon said prayers for peace and against the enemies of the Byzantine Empire.⁹² A prayer by Pope Zachary (741–752) supposedly inspired the Lombard King Liutprand (712–744) to remorse.⁹³

There were several variations on the theme of God's offering his protection. God frees people from evils.⁹⁴ God is asked to protect the petitioners with his right hand,⁹⁵ through his mercy,⁹⁶ or day and night.⁹⁷ He is asked to provide eternal protection.⁹⁸ In one formulation, God is envisioned as a father surrounding his family with celestial protection.⁹⁹ The antiphoner refers to

(*de quacumque tribulatione*), whereas MS Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève 111 has antiphons of mercy (*de misericordia*), i.e. to request God show mercy so tribulations would come to an end.

⁸³ For early medieval prayers against enemies, see P. De Clerck, "L'immagine dei nemici nelle antiche orazioni romane," in *I nemici della cristianità*, ed. G. Ruggieri (Bologna, 1997), 59–81; C. Erdmann, "Der Heidenkrieg in der Liturgie und die Kaiserkrönung Ottos I.," *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung*, 46 (1932), 129–42; M. McCormick, "The Liturgy of War in the Early Middle Ages: Crisis, Litanies, and the Carolingian Monarchy," *Viator*, 15 (1984), 1–23.

⁸⁴ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 342 (formulae 997–8); *Antiphonale*, 214–15.

⁸⁵ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 342 (formula 997).

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, i, 342 (formula 998).

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, i, 319 (formula 886), 325 (formula 922), 327 (formula 932).

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, i, 327 (formula 930).

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, i, 247 (formula 602), 249 (formula 609 [PC]), 280 (formula 725 [PC]), 322 (formula 904).

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, i, 304 (formula 818 [C]).

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, i, 333 (formula 968).

⁹² *Vie de Théodore de Sykéon*, ed. A.J. Festugière, 2 vols (Brussels, 1970), i, 46–7.

⁹³ LP (Duchesne), i, 428.

⁹⁴ *L'ordinaire*, 86 (*Libera nos*).

⁹⁵ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 321 (formula 896).

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, i, 306 (formula 823 [C]).

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, i, 329 (formula 941).

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, i, 107 (formula 64 [PC]).

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, i, 326 (formula 925).

God as a protector¹⁰⁰ and asks him to protect the petitioner.¹⁰¹ This is a feature of Greek prayer as well: God is asked to offer humans defense and protection through their lives.¹⁰² Many prayers for protection are ambiguous against *what* or *whom* they are meant to protect, which would increase the usefulness of the prayer. God is called upon to defend them from all dangers, including unnamed ones. Old prayers could be recycled to fight against new foes.¹⁰³

Certain processions provided dramatic opportunities to request aid or thank God. Gregory I led the annual tradition of the Major Litany in the city of Rome, which traveled from the Roman church San Lorenzo in Lucina to San Pietro in Vaticano on 25 April.¹⁰⁴ The observance involved a procession, with the participants chanting hymns, and a celebration of Mass at San Pietro in Vaticano. It was not enough, however, to take part in this litany physically; Gregory instructed the faithful to have devout minds when participating. Gregory taught that the litany had a twofold rationale: to ask God to purify them from sin, which would help to alleviate the disasters that sin had caused; and to thank God for the things he had given in the past and the present. The Major Litany would be carried out in Rome for the entire period under study here.

Narrative sources provide concrete examples in which prayer was designed to counter foes. Gregory I told the bishops of Sicily to institute a litany for every Wednesday and Friday in order to request divine protection against the “barbaric” Lombards.¹⁰⁵ In 593, Emperor Maurice (582–602), upon hearing a prophecy that he would be assassinated, decided to go barefoot in a litany with the whole city, to do penance and to ward off this fate.¹⁰⁶ Pope Zachary prayed to God to provide comfort to the people of Ravenna and Rome from the king of the Lombards, Liutprand – a prayer that, according to the biographer, God granted by removing the king from the world before his time!¹⁰⁷ Although this story did not depict it as Pope Zachary’s intention, the implication is that his prayer had caused Liutprand’s death, something that would run counter to the spirit of

¹⁰⁰ *Antiphonale*, 54–5, 76–7, 118–19, 130–31, 174–5, 176–7, 178–9, 186–7.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 70–71.

¹⁰² *L’Eucologio Barberini Gr. 336*, 243–4 (formula 282, no. 2).

¹⁰³ For this feature of later prayers, see A. Linder, *Raising Arms: Liturgy in the Struggle to Liberate Jerusalem in the Late Middle Ages* (Turnhout, 2003), esp. 98–102, 175–9.

¹⁰⁴ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 1096. J. Dyer, “Roman Processions of the Major Litany (*litaniae maiores*) from the Sixth to the Twelfth Century,” in *Roma Felix: Formation and Reflections of Medieval Rome*, ed. É. Ó Carragáin and C. Neuman de Vegvar (Aldershot and Burlington, VT, 2007), 113–37, at 114.

¹⁰⁵ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 919–20.

¹⁰⁶ Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia*, i, 283.

¹⁰⁷ LP (Duchesne), i, 431.

Gregory I's counsel about the proper use of prayer. Pope Zachary later organized a litany in thanksgiving for negotiating successfully with the Lombards.¹⁰⁸

The protection offered by prayer extended beyond the political world into nature. Prayer had control over natural disasters, a significant advantage for a city in which agriculture was a major sector of the economy and where many maintained intramural farms. Such orations make reference either to rain or the harvest. Prayer could be employed to increase rain in times of drought.¹⁰⁹ A prayer asking for rain requests that God give celestial water.¹¹⁰ A similar prayer requested that God open the font of his kindness and pour heavenly waters on arid land.¹¹¹ One Greek prayer was designed against drought, asking God for rain and requesting that he show mercy instead of withholding rain because of sin.¹¹² On the other hand, prayer could equally be employed for excessive rain.¹¹³ God was asked in his mercy to repress showers.¹¹⁴ Another prayer called for an end to flooding by stressing the positives the rain had achieved – for some to be reborn and others to be corrected – thus fulfilling the reason for its existence.¹¹⁵

Some popes organized large-scale liturgies to help against excessive rain. Pope Adeodatus (672–676) orchestrated litanies on a daily basis to ensure that, in spite of the torrential rainfall that occurred, farmers would be able to thresh and store grain.¹¹⁶ Gregory II (715–731) spearheaded a series of litanies to end the flooding of the Tiber and to rid the city of the excess water it had unleashed.¹¹⁷

Other orations related to the production of grain. One of the prayers in the Gregorian Sacramentary is designed to create growth on a piece of land.¹¹⁸ In the antiphoner, God is said to have blessed the land.¹¹⁹ Prayer could multiply the gift of grain.¹²⁰ Greek prayers were employed for several aspects of agriculture: for those who harvested,¹²¹ those beginning the sowing,¹²² the harvest itself,¹²³ and

¹⁰⁸ LP (Duchense), i, 429.

¹⁰⁹ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 343 (formulae 1000–1002); *Antiphonale*, 210–11.

¹¹⁰ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 343 (formula 1000).

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, i, 343 (formula 1001).

¹¹² *L'Eucologio Barberini Gr.* 336, 190–91 (formulae 194–5).

¹¹³ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 344 (formulae 1003–4); *Antiphonale*, 212–13.

¹¹⁴ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 344 (formula 1004).

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, i, 344 (formula 1003).

¹¹⁶ LP (Mommsen), 191.

¹¹⁷ LP (Duchesne), i, 399–400.

¹¹⁸ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 344 (formula 1005).

¹¹⁹ *Antiphonale*, 6–7.

¹²⁰ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 344 (formula 1005).

¹²¹ *L'Eucologio Barberini Gr.* 336, 202 (formula 215, no. 2).

¹²² *Ibid.*, 202 (formula 216, no. 2).

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 203 (formula 218, no. 2).

the overall health of the climate.¹²⁴ Liturgy was thought to have an effect on growth: Isidore associated the new crops that sprung up after the celebration of Easter with the Easter liturgies.¹²⁵ Holy water blessed by priests was distributed to the faithful after baptism to sprinkle on vineyards and fields,¹²⁶ likely in the belief that it would aid growth.

In some instances, other disasters were addressed by prayer. Orations could ensure that animals infected by an epidemic not perish.¹²⁷ A prayer made by an Egyptian named David was said to have extinguished a fire in a field.¹²⁸ Prayers also helped against earthquakes.¹²⁹

One saint renowned for his control of nature through the liturgy was Theodore of Sykeon. He wandered around Asia Minor between the late-sixth and early-seventh centuries (although his life was not written down until the mid-seventh century). Theodore led processions to stop hail from damaging a vineyard,¹³⁰ to cause locusts to die,¹³¹ and to make rain fall in parched Jerusalem.¹³² A procession and holy water were able to save both people and animals from the plague.¹³³ On another occasion he caused a heavy rainfall by a procession, the chanting of a litany, the reading of a Gospel, the celebration of Communion, and prayer for rain.¹³⁴

Prayer also served as an ally against the ravages of disease.¹³⁵ Prayers in the Gregorian Sacramentary and musical texts in the antiphoner were designed against plague.¹³⁶ Gregory told the story of a man who became a monk but neglected the way of life connected with his new calling.¹³⁷ He fell victim to the plague, complete with visions of a dragon devouring him, a fate that he was only delivered from when his fellow monks prayed for him. One Greek prayer was said to help people who were sick, asking that they be released from their sins and the consequence of sin,¹³⁸ implying that the root cause of their illness

¹²⁴ Ibid., 203 (formula 217, no. 2).

¹²⁵ Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, ed. W.M. Lindsay, 2 vols (Oxford, 1911), i, 240.

¹²⁶ OR XI:95 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 445).

¹²⁷ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 345 (formula 1006).

¹²⁸ John Moschos, *Spiritual Meadow*, PG, lxxxvii, 3053, 3056.

¹²⁹ *L'Eucologio Barberini Gr. 336*, 214–15 (formula 233, no. 2).

¹³⁰ *Vie de Théodore de Sykéon*, 45.

¹³¹ Ibid., 32.

¹³² Ibid., 44–5.

¹³³ Ibid., 40–41.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 80–82.

¹³⁵ A theme discussed for a later period in P. Kershaw, "Illness, Power and Prayer in Asser's *Life of King Alfred*," *Early Medieval Europe*, 10 (2001), 201–24.

¹³⁶ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 345 (formulae 1007–9); *Antiphonale*, 212–13.

¹³⁷ Gregory I, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, 149–52 (sermon 19).

¹³⁸ *L'Eucologio Barberini Gr. 336*, 350–51 (formulae 196–8).

was sin. The most famous example of a large-scale effort against disease in the city of Rome was Gregory I's sevenfold litanies, at least two occasions of which have been recorded.¹³⁹ As Isidore explained, a litany was a prayer executed to petition God for something and ask for his mercy.¹⁴⁰ In Gregory's litanies, various subsections of society from different regions of the city converged on a single church, chanting *Kyrie eleison* (Lord, have mercy) as they walked to implore divine mercy against the ravages of the sixth-century Justinianic plague. The seven groups in the litanies likely corresponded to the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit.¹⁴¹ In both versions of the processions, the plague was seen as divine punishment for sin. There was no guarantee that participation in the litanies would ensure physical health, but at least people would be cleansed of sin before succumbing to the disease, and might achieve salvation in the next life.

John R.C. Martyn has argued that the sevenfold litany performed in 603 was a covert plan to disparage the "plague" of the usurper to the imperial throne Phocas (602–610) and his violence towards his predecessor Maurice, rather than the literal plague.¹⁴² While ingenious, this argument strains credulity, and even its author concedes the difficulty of sustaining his position. There is no positive evidence for organizing litanies under false pretenses, or without the participants' being aware of what they were hoping to accomplish. It would have been reckless to antagonize the new emperor, who surely would have removed Gregory I from office and made it impossible for him to fulfill his mission as pope. This interpretation simply ignores contemporary testimony for what this and similar processions were intended to accomplish. Likely this argument is rooted in long-standing apologetics meant to absolve Gregory for welcoming the new emperor and his images despite the grisly dispatch of the old emperor, whom Gregory personally knew during his time in Constantinople. Gregory was probably acting from political expediency in accepting Phocas, and perhaps too he hoped to convince the new emperor to forbid the noxious title "ecumenical" patriarch.¹⁴³

The liturgy was to become a conduit for performing miracles on earth. During the chanting of prayers at Mass, Theodore's new silver chalice and paten

¹³⁹ Gregory I, *Registrum*, ii, 1102–4; Gregory of Tours, *Gregorii Turonensis Opera*, Vol. 1: *Libri historiarum X*, ed. B. Krusch, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum (Hanover, 1937), 479–81. See J.A. Latham, "The Making of a Papal Rome: Gregory I and the *letania septiformis*," in *The Power of Religion in Late Antiquity*, ed. A. Cain and N. Lenski (Farnham, Surrey and Burlington, VT, 2009), 293–304.

¹⁴⁰ Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, i, 255.

¹⁴¹ OR XI:100 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 446); Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, i, 269.

¹⁴² J.R.C. Martyn, "Four Notes on the Registrum of Gregory the Great," *Parergon*, N.S. 19 (2002), 5–38, at 16–23.

¹⁴³ D.M. Olster, *The Politics of Usurpation in the Seventh Century: Rhetoric and Revolution in Byzantium* (Amsterdam, 1993), 165, 169–72.

turned black.¹⁴⁴ His suspicions that something was amiss were confirmed when he learned that the silver used to craft them had once been a prostitute's chamber pot! The power of the Mass was made manifest in the miraculous healing of a mute and lame man by Pope Agapitus (535–536), which was said to be rooted in the power of the sacrifice and the authority of St Peter.¹⁴⁵ After Agapitus had celebrated Mass, he was able to lift the man to his feet; and, after placing the consecrated bread in the man's mouth, his ability to speak was restored.¹⁴⁶ Prayer even held the key to bridging the distance between life and death: one subdeacon was able to bring a man back to life through prayer.¹⁴⁷

Not all miracles, however, had positive results and saved lives. In one of the most surprising stories in the cycle of the seventh-century bishop John the Almsgiver, John celebrated Mass on an altar with a bag of money under it, which had been given to him by a generous donor.¹⁴⁸ Dismayed to find that his son had been killed in spite of the prayers said for him, the donor was informed by the bishop that it was because of the prayers that he lost his life. Death meant that his son had been saved from committing worst deeds and being damned. His early death assured him of a happy afterlife!

Rewards of Prayer: Spiritual Gifts

The second broad category of prayer concerns the spiritual realm. Papal prayer often promised the petitioner certain intangible spiritual gifts from God. These included mercy, joy, and illumination. These benefits were often not explained in detail and tended not to be connected with any specific circumstance.

God was repeatedly called upon to show mercy to the petitioner. God would bestow mercy on those who requested it, for cleansing sin.¹⁴⁹ God was asked that the petitioner would be worthy to gain mercy and not judgment for his sins.¹⁵⁰ It was requested that God's mercy not depart from people and that it remove the petitioners' errors.¹⁵¹ One prayer asks that the petitioner be devoted

¹⁴⁴ *Vie de Théodore de Sykéôn*, 36–8.

¹⁴⁵ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, ii, 268, 270.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, ii, 268, 270.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, ii, 336, 338, 340.

¹⁴⁸ Leontios of Neapolis, *Vie de Syméon le Fou; Vie de Jean de Chypre*, ed. A.J. Festugière, Bibliothèque archéologique et historique, 95 (Paris, 1974), 376–8.

¹⁴⁹ *L'ordinaire*, 62 (*Kyrie eleison*), 64 (*Gloria in excelsis Deo*), 88 (*Agnus Dei*); *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 295 (formula 780 [PC]), 311 (formula 840), 314 (formula 857), 318 (formula 879), 327 (formula 934), 331 (formula 959).

¹⁵⁰ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 311 (formula 840).

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, i, 322 (formula 902).

to God with all his heart so that humans might gain mercy,¹⁵² making the former a precondition for the latter. This is true in the antiphoner as well. God's mercy is singled out among his virtues,¹⁵³ and God is requested to show his mercy.¹⁵⁴ At other times, the antiphon says the petitioner has received God's mercy.¹⁵⁵

Joy was also requested through prayer. Some stress the joy to be experienced in heaven,¹⁵⁶ and others ask that God bring people to eternal joy.¹⁵⁷ The prayers of the Gregorian Sacramentary stress the sense of joy that the participants are supposed to feel at the reception of the Eucharist.¹⁵⁸

In many cases, God was asked to illuminate or grant light to the faithful. For instance, God is asked to illuminate darkness,¹⁵⁹ hearts,¹⁶⁰ minds,¹⁶¹ people,¹⁶² and the Church.¹⁶³ In one prayer, the petitioner asks to be infused with light, which would allow him to recognize God and to be carried away by his invisible love.¹⁶⁴ In another, the petitioner asks to be shown the light of high truth.¹⁶⁵ God is also requested to grant the light of his grace.¹⁶⁶

Pious tales from this period reveal that prayer and consecration were inextricably linked. In one story, a monk who recited the Eucharistic prayers while transporting the bread intended for use in Mass inadvertently caused its consecration and made it impossible for the priest who received the offerings to consecrate the already transformed bread.¹⁶⁷ While primarily a cautionary tale about allowing the wrong people to know these prayers or reciting them at an incorrect time, it shows the efficacy of the prayers (and not actions) in transforming the offerings. It was believed that the Holy Spirit responded to the

¹⁵² Ibid., i, 329 (formula 945).

¹⁵³ *Antiphonale*, 48–9, 56–7, 62–3, 64–5, 84–5, 106–7, 114–15, 118–19, 142–3, 172–3, 180–81, 188–9, 202–3, 204–5, 206–7, 208–9, 212–13.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 2–3, 8–9, 50–51, 62–3, 64–5, 70–71, 82–3, 86–7, 112–13, 175–6; 188–9, 204–5; 206–7.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 38–9.

¹⁵⁶ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 99 (formula 36 [C]), 128 (formula 142 [OSO]), 134 (formula 169), 197 (formula 408 [C]), 199 (formula 419 [PC]), 202 (formula 429 [C]), 231 (formula 541 [PC]), 255 (formula 633 [C]).

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., i, 128 (formula 142 [OSO]), 332 (formula 964).

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., i, 240 (formula 576 [PC]), 293 (formula 773 [PC]).

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., i, 328 (formula 936).

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., i, 163 (formula 296 [C]), 328 (formula 935).

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 137 (formula 183), 230 (formula 538 [C]), 297 (formula 787 [C]).

¹⁶² Ibid., i, 115 (formula 92), 116 (formula 98), 328 (formula 938).

¹⁶³ Ibid., i, 108 (formula 67 [C]).

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., i, 103 (formula 51).

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., i, 104 (formula 54).

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., i, 123 (formula 123 [C]).

¹⁶⁷ John Moschos, *Spiritual Meadow*, PG, lxxxvii, 2869, 2872.

prayers since the Spirit was absent during the priest's attempt at consecration.¹⁶⁸ As another cautionary tale reminds us, the words of the Eucharistic prayers were so powerful that it was important that only the proper people recited them. As part of a game, a group of children play acted the Mass, with each of the boys taking one of the roles of the clergy.¹⁶⁹ One of the boys had learned the Eucharistic prayers by heart and repeated them with his friends.¹⁷⁰ Rather than transform the offerings, a heavenly fire descended, burning up the bread and wine and traumatizing the children.

If legitimately offered, consecration could confer benefits on the celebrant. Gregory told the tale of Bishop Cassius of Narni, who offered a sacrifice to God every day.¹⁷¹ Although he would break down in tears of contrition during the celebration of the Mass, one of his priests had a vision that warned the bishop to continue doing the same and not to be idle. The priest also related that God promised the bishop a reward. Seven years later, after the bishop had celebrated the Mass and taken the Eucharist, his reward was revealed to be death and a blessed afterlife. The sacrifice had placated God's anger and led to the bishop's salvation.

As the above example already shows, prayer had the power to blunt God's anger. In some cases, God is requested to avert his anger caused by human sins,¹⁷² allowing the person to repent. God is asked to turn away the whips of his anger that people deserve for their sins,¹⁷³ and to free his people from the terrors of his anger.¹⁷⁴ Another prayer was designed around avoiding God's anger in the first place, asking God to teach the petitioner to fear what angers him and love what he instructs.¹⁷⁵ Gregory I thought prayer was the only thing that could staunch God's anger, but that this prayer had to be inspired by God.¹⁷⁶ For example, David held back the sword of the angel – a symbol of divine punishment – through prayer.¹⁷⁷

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 2869, 2872.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 3080–81, 3084.

¹⁷⁰ R.F. Taft, "Was the Eucharistic Anaphora Recited Secretly or Aloud? The Ancient Tradition and What Became of It," in *Worship Traditions in Armenia and the Neighboring Christian East* (Crestwood, NY, 2006), 15–57, at 34–5.

¹⁷¹ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, iii, 194, 196; *Homiliae in Evangelia*, 355–8 (sermon 37).

¹⁷² *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 312 (formula 843), 315 (formulae 860, 862–3), 317 (formula 873), 345 (formulae 1007–8).

¹⁷³ Ibid., i, 132 (formula 158 [C]), 139 (formula 192).

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., i, 345 (formula 1009).

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., i, 200 (formula 420).

¹⁷⁶ Gregory I, *Moralia in Job*, i, 473–4.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., i, 473–4. Gregory makes a reference here to 2 Samuel 24:10.

A careful reading of the prayers of the Mass proves that they had the power to expiate sins, at least minor ones.¹⁷⁸ Before the widespread availability of auricular confession and a standard method of penance, prayer provided a communal way to cleanse sin.¹⁷⁹ Sin was a major concern of papal prayer: a long series of formulae is devoted to combating sin.¹⁸⁰ Liturgical prayer could forgive or cleanse sin. The Scriptural *locus classicus* for this belief was Matthew 26:28, when, during at the Last Supper, Jesus said that the chalice was poured out for the remission of sins.¹⁸¹ A modified version of this verse was incorporated into the Canon.¹⁸² This was evident at other points in the Mass as well. The *Gloria in excelsis Deo* implies that God had the power to remove sin and would do so after hearing the petitioner's prayer.¹⁸³ The prayer said after the Gospel could eliminate sin.¹⁸⁴

The Gregorian Sacramentary has many variations on the forgiveness of sin through prayer, with the petitioner asking to be absolved from sin;¹⁸⁵ to be purged from sins;¹⁸⁶ to be absolved for sins and not to be given the punishment deserved;¹⁸⁷ to be purified;¹⁸⁸ to cleanse the stains of our sins;¹⁸⁹ or to gain a purified mind through the liturgy.¹⁹⁰ One prayer asked that God purge the

¹⁷⁸ As investigated with the Verona Collection of *libelli missarum* in P. Sorci, *L'eucaristia per la remissione dei peccati: Ricerca nel sacramentario Veronese* (Palermo, 1979). More broadly, see D.A. Tanghe, "L'eucharistie pour la rémission des péchés," *Irenikon*, 24 (1961), 165–81; and (for the East) L. Ligier, "Pénitence et eucharistie en Orient," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 29 (1963), 5–74.

¹⁷⁹ On the complexity of early medieval penance, see S. Hamilton, *The Practice of Penance, 900–1050* (Woodbridge, Suffolk and Rochester, NY, 2001).

¹⁸⁰ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 311–17 (formulae 840–75).

¹⁸¹ "[H]ic est enim sanguis meus novi testamenti qui pro multis effunditur in remissionem peccatorum."

¹⁸² *L'ordinaire*, 80: "HIC ENIM CALIX SANGUINIS MEI, NOVI ET AETERNI TESTAMENTI: MYSTERIUM FIDEI: QUI PRO VOBIS ET PRO MULTIS EFFUNDETUR IN REMISSIONEM PECCATORUM."

¹⁸³ *L'ordinaire*, 64. Some of the same wording is used in the *Agnus Dei* (*L'ordinaire*, 86), without the reference to prayer.

¹⁸⁴ *L'ordinaire*, 64.

¹⁸⁵ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 130 (formula 150 [C]), 137 (formula 181 [OSO]), 201 (formula 426 [PC]), 253 (formula 622 [C]), 257 (formula 640 [OSO]), 274 (formula 702 [C]).

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, i, 143 (formula 210 [OSO]), 234 (formula 555 [PC]), 254 (formula 627 [PC]).

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, i, 135 (formula 174).

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, i, 158 (formula 274 [OSO]), 168 (formula 316 [OSO]), 282 (formula 734 [PC]).

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, i, 210 (formula 464 [OSO]), 275 (formula 707 [OSO]), 286 (formula 746 [OSO]), 288 (formula 755 [OSO]).

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, i, 114 (formula 91 [PC]).

petitioner's vices but fulfill his just desires.¹⁹¹ God is asked to take away sins¹⁹² or to take away the sins of his people according to his mercy.¹⁹³ One evocative prayer asks that God put out the flames of sins.¹⁹⁴ In one antiphon, God is asked to hear the prayer of his servants and have mercy because the petitioners have sinned.¹⁹⁵ The same theme appears in Greek prayers. One prayer stresses that it was because of God's love that the petitioners, though sinners, could offer sacrifices for their sins and be cleansed of their impurity.¹⁹⁶ God was said to pardon sins.¹⁹⁷ In some cases, God is asked to cleanse people with the Eucharist.¹⁹⁸ Gregory I did not consider himself exempt from the need to be cleansed from sin: as part of his request for prayers, he expressed his hope that they would wash away his filth.¹⁹⁹

In the course of the Mass, it was the Eucharist in particular that worked against sins. For Gregory, the sacrifice of the altar was a uniquely effective method to absolve sin.²⁰⁰ As Gregory phrased it, the passion of Jesus is imitated in the Mass in order to cleanse sins.²⁰¹ A prayer requested that the Eucharist will expiate sins.²⁰² The cleansing of sin through the sacrifice was a repeated desire of petitioners, asking for the Eucharistic gifts to cleanse people of sins²⁰³ or for cleansing by heavenly mysteries.²⁰⁴

But the Mass was not the only liturgy that offered the hope of forgiveness of sin. Baptism was the premier opportunity to cleanse sin.²⁰⁵ Prayers against sin were also appropriate for the dead. Prayers for the deceased ask that the petitioner first be cleansed of sins in order to enjoy the glory of the saints.²⁰⁶ A

¹⁹¹ Ibid., i, 168 (formula 314 [PC]), 252 (formula 621 [PC]).

¹⁹² *Antiphonale*, 174–5, 208–9, 210–11.

¹⁹³ Ibid., 206–7.

¹⁹⁴ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 141 (formula 199 [C]).

¹⁹⁵ *Antiphonale*, 216–17.

¹⁹⁶ *L'Eucologio Barberini Gr*, 85 (formula 46, no. 2).

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 211–12 (formula 228, no. 2).

¹⁹⁸ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 299 (formula 795 [OSO]).

¹⁹⁹ Gregory I, *Moralia in Job*, iii, 1810–11.

²⁰⁰ Gregory I, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, 353–4 (sermon 37).

²⁰¹ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, iii, 200, 202.

²⁰² *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 297 (formula 789 [PC]).

²⁰³ Ibid., i, 103 (formula 50 [OSO]), 112 (formula 84 [PC]), 121 (formula 115 [OSO]), 135 (formula 172 [OSO]), 143 (formula 207 [PC]), 144 (formula 214 [OSO]), 147–8 (formula 230 [OSO]), 155 (formula 265 [OSO]), 156 (formula 266 [PC]), 157 (formula 270 [OSO]), 161 (formula 286 [OSO]), 228 (formula 530), 239 (formula 572 [OSO]), 244 (formula 590 [OSO]).

²⁰⁴ Ibid., i, 112 (formula 83 [OSO]), 122 (formula 118 [OSO]), 129 (formula 145 [OSO]).

²⁰⁵ OR XI:67 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 435–7).

²⁰⁶ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 347–8 (formulae 1015–17).

monk had his sins forgiven directly by God when he prostrated himself before the night office.²⁰⁷

There were qualifications, however, on the capacity of prayer to effect forgiveness of sin. In order to gain God's forgiveness through prayer, one would first have to forgive others: as Gregory I put it, the medicine of salvation cannot be applied to wounded limbs until the sword is withdrawn from the wound.²⁰⁸ Some people attempted to exploit the cleansing power of prayer. John the Almsgiver refused to ordain one man who wanted to bribe his way into becoming a deacon by giving charity, John's soft spot.²⁰⁹ The man believed that by serving at the altar, he would be forgiven from sin.

Being cleansed of sin served a practical purpose on earth. Someone with a purified mind would be able to render more fitting service to God.²¹⁰ If a person was free from sin, he would experience no adversity, implying that problems are a punishment for sin.²¹¹ Yet the most significant rewards for forgiveness of sins awaited one after death.

The point of forgiveness of sin was to achieve salvation. Prayers directly requested that God grant salvation, but it also came through consecration (which itself could only be achieved through prayer) and the Eucharist. Connecting salvation to the Mass is not a new observation. It has been argued that the Mass was part of a great drama of salvation.²¹² It incorporated people into the story of Jesus' life and made them personally experience the emotions of Biblical figures. But there is a less dramatic, more direct, and functional tie that prayers and the liturgy had with salvation. Since these prayers were offered publicly and applied to all, they reflect the sense that the entire Christian community benefited in their search for salvation.

Several prayers and narrative sources request that God grant salvation.²¹³ This is illustrated in the prayers of the Mass that would be pronounced at every celebration. Sacrifice could grant salvation and help someone to avoid damnation.²¹⁴ The possibilities of salvation or damnation are presented as

²⁰⁷ Gregory I, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, 317–18 (sermon 34).

²⁰⁸ Gregory I, *Moralia in Job*, i, 558–9.

²⁰⁹ Leontios of Neapolis, *Vie de Syméon le Fou; Vie de Jean de Chypre*, 355–6.

²¹⁰ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 225 (formula 519).

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, i, 133 (formula 165).

²¹² O.B. Hardison, "The Mass as Sacred Drama," in *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages: Essays in the Origin and Early History of Modern Drama* (Baltimore, MD, 1965), 35–79, at 46–7.

²¹³ For the language of salvation in Roman prayer, see M.P. Ellebracht, *Remarks on the Vocabulary of the Ancient Orations in the Missale Romanum* (Nijmegen, 1963), 13–15, 55–6, 187–9.

²¹⁴ *L'ordinaire*, 76: The *Memento* is offered up "pro redemptione animarum suarum, pro spe salutis," whereas the *Hanc igitur* is in part meant to avoid damnation: "ab aeterna

diametrically opposed paths in the prayers.²¹⁵ A sense of eternity is inherent in the dual species of the Eucharist: "... the holy bread of eternal life, and the chalice of perpetual salvation."²¹⁶ Both the consecration and the mixture of the bread and wine after the consecration were believed to lead to eternal life.²¹⁷ It appears too in the *Fiat commixtio*, a prayer spoken when the bread consecrated at the current Mass was mixed with the wine of the chalice: "Let the mixing and consecration of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ [bring us] who receive it into eternal life."²¹⁸ This connection between receiving the Eucharist and one day receiving eternal life also comes across in the words of the priest when distributing the consecrated bread: "May the body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve your soul."²¹⁹

The prayers of the Gregorian Sacramentary expressed the connection between Mass and eternal salvation in several ways. Some prayers are fairly direct in requesting to receive, gain, or reach salvation.²²⁰ God is asked to repel iniquities to allow the petitioner to achieve salvation.²²¹ Others stress the eternity of the new life: that one be given or attain perpetual or eternal life;²²² or receive eternal blessedness.²²³ Others ask that God cause an increase in eternal redemption²²⁴ or an increase in salvation.²²⁵ Some specifically say that gaining salvation is a gift, like those prayers that ask to receive eternal or heavenly gifts or rewards²²⁶ or to gain salvific gifts.²²⁷ Others focus on the kingdom: to lead

damnatione nos eripi."

²¹⁵ Ibid., 80: "Necnon ab inferis resurrectionis, sed in caelos gloriosae ascensionis."

²¹⁶ Ibid., 82: "Panem sanctum vitae aeternae, et Calicem salutis perpetuae."

²¹⁷ Ibid., 86, 88.

²¹⁸ OR I:107. T. Klauser, *A Short History of the Western Liturgy: An Account and Some Reflections*, trans. J. Halliburton (London, 1969), 67.

²¹⁹ *The Earliest Life of Gregory the Great by an Anonymous Monk of Whitby*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave (Cambridge, 1985), 106: "Corpus Domini nostri Iesu Christi conservet animam tuam."

²²⁰ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 98 (formula 33 [C]), 101 (formula 43 [OSO]), 107 (formula 66), 117 (formula 103 [OSO]), 146 (formula 223 [PC]), 146 (formula 225 [C]), 148 (formula 233 [OSO]), 149 (formula 237 [OSO]), 151 (formula 246 [PC]).

²²¹ Ibid., i, 330 (formula 947).

²²² Ibid., i, 170 (formula 326 [PC]), 193 (formula 392 [C]), 216 (formula 487 [PC]), 220 (formula 498 [OSO]).

²²³ Ibid., i, 199 (formula 416 [OSO]).

²²⁴ Ibid., i, 144 (formula 215 [PC]), 155 (formula 262 [PC]).

²²⁵ Ibid., i, 210 (formula 462 [PC]), 236 (formula 561 [PC]).

²²⁶ Ibid., i, 99 (formula 34 [OSO]), 162–3 (formula 294 [PC]), 191 (formula 384 [OSO]), 194 (formula 393 [OSO]), 303 (formula 813).

²²⁷ Ibid., i, 256 (formula 634 [OSO]).

people to the heavenly kingdom;²²⁸ to enter into the kingdom;²²⁹ or to rejoice in the celestial kingdom.²³⁰ Like the last of these prayers, some stress the joy to be experienced in heaven: to enjoy the joys in heaven;²³¹ to come to or bring about eternal joy;²³² to seek out joys of eternal promise;²³³ to receive eternal joy of God's society;²³⁴ or to rejoice in God's face.²³⁵ One prayer asks that humans are able to share in the divinity of the one who shared their humanity.²³⁶ Other prayers are more circumspect, asking to gain an eternal remedy²³⁷ or to gain the remedies of eternal salvation.²³⁸ One requests that, after having received celestial gifts, they would not come to judgment but instead receive a remedy.²³⁹ Communion purged a petitioner from sin and made people inheritors of celestial remedies.²⁴⁰ The connection between liturgy and salvation was not confined to the Mass. Baptism allowed new Christians to achieve salvation as well.²⁴¹

In reporting the results from prayers that make reference to the term *salus* or its derivatives, one note of caution is necessary. This term had a long prehistory, once the center of its own ancient cult and then employed in imperial worship.²⁴² When it was incorporated into the field of Roman prayers, it could be used to refer alternatively to physical health or salvation.²⁴³ One is left with the conclusion that in Rome, the health of the body and of the soul were intimately connected and to some degree interdependent.²⁴⁴ That being said, in many cases

²²⁸ Ibid., i, 152 (formula 250 [PC]), 156 (formula 266 [PC]).

²²⁹ Ibid., i, 206 (formula 445).

²³⁰ Ibid., i, 208 (formula 456).

²³¹ Ibid., i, 99 (formula 36 [C]).

²³² Ibid., i, 128 (formula 142 [OSO]), 197 (formula 408 [C]), 199 (formula 419 [PC]), 202 (formula 429 [C]), 231 (formula 541 [PC]).

²³³ Ibid., i, 134 (formula 169).

²³⁴ Ibid., i, 255 (formula 633 [C]).

²³⁵ Ibid., i, 257 (formula 641 [C]).

²³⁶ Ibid., i, 106 (formula 59).

²³⁷ Ibid., i, 108 (formula 70), 112 (formula 82 [C]), 124 (formula 126 [PC]), 126 (formula 133), 141 (formula 201 [PC]), 162 (formula 292 [C]), 169 (formula 321 [PC]).

²³⁸ Ibid., i, 277 (formula 714 [C]).

²³⁹ Ibid., i, 158 (formula 275 [PC]).

²⁴⁰ Ibid., i, 143 (formula 207 [PC]).

²⁴¹ OR XI:1, 6, 61, 71 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 417, 419, 433, 440).

²⁴² M.A. Marwood, *The Roman Cult of Salus* (Oxford, 1988); A. Alföldi, *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche* (Darmstadt, 1970), 196–9.

²⁴³ A. Blaise, *Le vocabulaire latin des principaux thèmes liturgiques* (Turnhout, 1966), 96. Ellebracht, *Remarks*, 55–6, 187–9. Ellebracht translates the adjectival form *salutaris* as “healthful, advantageous, Salvation-bringing” (187).

²⁴⁴ F. Paxton, *Christianizing Death: The Creation of a Ritual Process in Early Medieval Europe* (Ithaca, NY, 1990), 31, 58–9. I am indebted to Paxton for personally discussing this term with me.

the *salus* mentioned in the Gregorian Sacramentary appears much more likely to be salvation, as when eternal *salus* is referred to. Even when the *salus* mentioned appears more earthly than heavenly, however, the ultimate fulfillment of all uses of *salus* could be found in eternal salvation.²⁴⁵

The idea that prayer could lead to salvation was still prevalent in eighth-century Rome. The synod of Gregory III (731–741) in Rome in 732 makes reference to the chalice of salvation.²⁴⁶ One of its prayers stresses that just as the priests celebrated the celestial sacraments on earth, so too would they one day achieve eternal joys.²⁴⁷

Salvation is a major theme of the music of the Mass. In the antiphoner, God saves people or brings salvation to humans, and thus is sometimes asked directly for salvation.²⁴⁸ God is asked directly to save the petitioner²⁴⁹ and his people more generally.²⁵⁰ God is also asked, in a variation on this theme, to spare his people or his servant.²⁵¹ God is requested to serve as a helper and protector in gaining salvation.²⁵² Several of the antiphons describe God as the God of salvation or God of my salvation,²⁵³ making the granting of salvation one of God's primary functions. The salvation of the just is said to be from God.²⁵⁴

Some Greek prayers also provide a path to salvation. Several formulae request the salvation of petitioners' souls.²⁵⁵ Salvation was described as a kind of inheritance available to the faithful.²⁵⁶ The description of God stresses his

²⁴⁵ H. Büsse, "*Salus*" in der römischen Liturgie: ein Beitrag zur Sprache und Theologie liturgischer Gebetstexte (Rome, 1960), esp. 52–5.

²⁴⁶ H. Mordek, "Rom, Byzanz und die Franken im 8. Jahrhundert: zur Überlieferung und kirchenpolitischen Bedeutung der Synodus Romana Papst Gregors III. vom 732 (mit Edition)," in *Person und Gemeinschaft im Mittelalter: Karl Schmid zum fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag* (Sigmaringen, 1988), 123–56, at 148: "Calicem salutaris accipiam et nomen domini invocabo." For a liturgical commentary on this source, see L. Eizenhöfer, "Die Marmormessen Gregors III," *Ephemerides liturgicae*, 67 (1953), 112–28.

²⁴⁷ Mordek, "Rom, Byzanz und die Franken," 150–51: "Sumpsimus, domine, sanctorum tuorum sollemnia celebrantes caelestia sacramenta; praesta, quaesumus, ut quod temporaliter gerimus, aeternis gaudiis consequamur."

²⁴⁸ *Antiphonale*, 2–3, 6–7, 8–9, 10–11, 14–15, 46–7.

²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 48–9, 58–9, 66–7, 74–5, 82–3.

²⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 64–5.

²⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 48–9, 64–5.

²⁵² *Ibid.*, 96–7.

²⁵³ *Ibid.*, 128–9, 176–7, 192–3.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 130–31, 146–7, 152–3.

²⁵⁵ *L'Eucologio Barberini Gr. 336*, 155 (formula 149), 166–7 (formula 158), 168–9 (formula 160), 170–72 (formulae 162–3).

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 86 (formulae 48, no. 5), 119 (formula 114, no. 2).

saving power.²⁵⁷ In one prayer Jesus is asked to bless, sanctify, unify, and finally to save all humans.²⁵⁸ In another, the petitioner prays to obtain remission from sins and to gain communion with the Holy Spirit,²⁵⁹ presumably in heaven. Baptism was particularly efficacious in leading to salvation. The prayers accompanying it made the baptized child an inheritor of God's kingdom and promised he would gain the beatitude of the elect.²⁶⁰

Among the prayers of the Mass, those intended for consecration and the Eucharist produced by this process were envisioned as effective in achieving salvation. For Gregory, the Eucharist had a special role in gaining salvation: "For this victim particularly saves the soul from eternal destruction, by which it renews for us the death of the Only Begotten through the mystery ..." ²⁶¹ Although Jesus is immortal and incorruptible, he is sacrificed for us again in the Eucharist.²⁶² The body and blood of Jesus are distributed to faithful people for their salvation.²⁶³ One of the greatest qualities of Pope Martin (649–655) was his offering the bloodless sacrifice of the Mass to God in order to save souls.²⁶⁴

The Eucharist was part of a happy death, allowing people to gain salvation. It was necessary that a dying person receive the final Communion (viaticum) before death: "because Communion will be for him a defender and helper in the resurrection of the just. It will resurrect him."²⁶⁵ Receiving the viaticum was so important to the person's salvation that the normal rules regarding fasting before Communion could be ignored.²⁶⁶ Gregory I told the story of the saintly Abbot Spes, who after having received the consecrated bread and wine, chanted the Psalms with the other monks; enraptured in prayer, he died.²⁶⁷ The holy woman Romula received the viaticum as well, and seeing a vision of a heavenly

²⁵⁷ Ibid., 63 (formulae 13, no. 2), 152 (formula 146, no. 10), 122–3 (formula 118, no. 2), 126–7 (formula 122, no. 2), 130–31 (formula 125, no. 2), 136–8 (formula 131), 164 (formula 156, no. 4), 175–6 (formula 167, no. 4).

²⁵⁸ Ibid., 208 (formula 225, no. 2).

²⁵⁹ Ibid., 68 (formula 17, no. 4).

²⁶⁰ Ibid., 123 (formula 118, no. 4).

²⁶¹ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, iii, 200, 202: "Haec namque singulariter uictima ab aeterno interitu animam saluat, quae illam nobis mortem Unigeniti per mysterium reparat ..."

²⁶² Ibid.

²⁶³ Ibid.

²⁶⁴ *Narrationes de exilio sancti papae Martini*, ed. and trans. in B. Neil, *Seventh-century Popes and Martyrs: The Political Hagiography of Anastasius Bibliothecarius* (Turnhout and NSW, Australia, 2006), 166–233, at 230–31.

²⁶⁵ OR XLIX:1 (*Les Ordines Romani*, iv, 529): "quia communio erit ei defensor et adiutor in resurrectione iustorum. Ipsa enim resuscitabit eum."

²⁶⁶ OR XLIX:1 (*Les Ordines Romani*, iv, 529).

²⁶⁷ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, iii, 48.

choir chanting the Psalms, she expired.²⁶⁸ The monk John took the viaticum and chanted the Psalms with his brothers before being called to heaven.²⁶⁹

The power released through the prayers of the Mass continued to aid those who were already dead. Gregory I was a primary proponent of the ability of the sacrifice of the Mass to provide benefits for the dead. The embrace of this belief, largely attributable to Gregory's popularity in Northern Europe, was fundamental to a major religious shift in the Middle Ages in which it became common to have votive Mass offered on behalf of people's souls.²⁷⁰ Whether or not he founded this tradition, as some would have it, Gregory's writings helped to promote the custom of celebrating Masses for 30 consecutive days on behalf of the soul of the dead.²⁷¹ Gregory explained his justification for holding Mass for the deceased:

If the sins after death are not unpardonable, the sacred offering of the salvific sacrificial gift normally helps souls a lot after death too, and thus sometimes the souls of the dead are seen to request this.²⁷²

Gregory I is at pains to make clear that not all of the dead will benefit from the sacrifice of the Mass: if a person has not led a good life in the first place, they will not have the grace to accept others' sacrificing the Mass on their behalf.²⁷³ Rather than depending on the generosity of others after your death, it is far better to offer the sacrifice on a daily basis while still living.²⁷⁴

Gregory I recounted a story from his own monastery, in which a monk, Justus, violated monastic rules by keeping private possessions and would only be freed from his guilt after death.²⁷⁵ Although he was cut off from contact with other

²⁶⁸ Ibid., iii, 66.

²⁶⁹ Ibid., iii, 118.

²⁷⁰ C. Vogel, "Deux conséquences de l'eschatologie Grégorienne: La multiplication des messes privées et les moines-prêtres," in *Grégoire le grand: Chantilly, Centre culturel Les Fontaines, 15-19 septembre 1982: actes*, ed. J. Fontaine, R. Gillet, and S. Pellistrandi (Paris, 1986), 267–76; A. Angenendt, "Missa specialis. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Entstehung der Privatmesse," in *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 17 (1983), 153–221; and reprinted in *Liturgie im Mittelalter: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. T. Flammer and D. Meyer (Münster, 2004), 111–90.

²⁷¹ R. Pfaff, "The English Devotion of St. Gregory's Trental," *Speculum*, 49 (1974), 75–90, at 75.

²⁷² Gregory I, *Dialogi*, iii, 184: "Si culpa post mortem insolubiles non sunt, multum solet animas etiam post mortem sacra oblatio hostiae salutaris adiuvare, ita ut hoc nonnumquam ipsae defunctorum animae videantur expetere."

²⁷³ Ibid., iii, 200.

²⁷⁴ Ibid., iii, 200, 202.

²⁷⁵ Ibid., iii, 188–94.

monks, the contrition he demonstrated in his last moments inspired his fellow monks to help him after death. After having celebrated Masses for 30 days in a row on his behalf, Justus appeared to one of the monks in a vision; he revealed that he had been miserable, but after the Masses were completed, he was allowed to partake in a heavenly Communion and was liberated from punishment. This was another example of someone freed “by the salvific sacrificial gift.”²⁷⁶

In another of Gregory’s tales on a similar theme, a priest prayed for the soul of a man who gave him assistance at the baths.²⁷⁷ Believing that the man was alive, the priest offered him bread in gratitude for his services; however, the man disclosed that he was deceased and being forced as punishment to serve as a ghostly bath attendant. To free him, the priest could offer the same bread to God in sacrifice. After a week of celebrating Mass for his soul, the man had been released from his terrestrial prison.

Like Gregory, the late-seventh- and early-eighth-century author Anastasius of Sinai believed that, in some instances, prayers could be beneficial for the souls of the dead.²⁷⁸ Anastasius’ opinion, based upon Dionysius the Areopagite, is that the deceased is only helped by liturgies offered for them if their sins are minor, and there is little that can be accomplished by Masses if they are guilty of more serious sins.²⁷⁹ A person should not pin all hopes of pardon for sin on offerings and liturgies after death,²⁸⁰ and it is better for individuals to tend to their own souls and not leave it up to the prayer of others.²⁸¹ Celebrating Masses for people may have a benefit for the deceased, but these cases are limited. It is better to work before death to improve the state of one’s soul.

There were also Greek prayers designed to aid people’s afterlives. One prayer asks for rest for the soul of the servant (whose name is spoken), and that his sins in word, works, and thoughts would be pardoned.²⁸² Another asks for rest and that he might have a Christian end without sin in deed and word.²⁸³ In one prayer known as a *diakonika*, a deacon would pray for the brothers who fell asleep in the faith, so that they would receive the mercy of God and be pardoned from their sins.²⁸⁴ The implication of these prayers is that sins would burden the person after death.

²⁷⁶ Ibid., iii, 194: “per salutorem hostiam.”

²⁷⁷ Ibid., iii, 184, 186, 188.

²⁷⁸ *Anastasii Sinaitae Quaestiones et responsiones*, ed. M. Richard and J.A. Munitiz, Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca, 59 (Turnhout, 2006), 96.

²⁷⁹ Ibid., 96.

²⁸⁰ Ibid., 96.

²⁸¹ Ibid., 96.

²⁸² *L’Eucologio Barberini Gr. 336*, 235 (formula 264, no. 2).

²⁸³ Ibid., 236 (formula 267, no. 2).

²⁸⁴ Ibid., 247–8 (formula 287).

Occasionally, a prayer was offered for the benefit of someone who was not, in fact, dead. In spite of the mistake, these prayers were not wasted; their power was so great that they produced results even when unable to carry out their primary intention. For example, in a time when many people were dying from the plague, one prisoner was presumed dead and was included among those prayed for.²⁸⁵ Because the man in question was actually alive, the prayers instead freed him from prison on the days that Masses were celebrated for the benefit of his soul. Gregory I tells the tale of a man taken captive whose wife offered the Mass for him on certain occasions.²⁸⁶ At the exact times when the Mass was said, the man would be freed from his chains. In a similar tale, a man who was chained up was freed when Theodore of Sykeon celebrated the Eucharist.²⁸⁷ Another account has a bishop sailing at sea. He lost a crewman and, giving him up for dead, decided to offer the Mass for the deliverance of his soul.²⁸⁸ Since the sailor was not dead but battling with the sea, he received mystical bread when the sacrifice was offered on his behalf; this nourishment strengthened him and allowed him to survive.

Breaking down the Temporal and Spiritual Realms

For analytical convenience I have been treating the temporal and the spiritual as if it were possible to separate the two. In early medieval Rome, however, these worlds naturally fused so that the world of the spiritual touched on and influenced the temporal existence. As has already been seen, Isidore's analysis of the petitions of the *Pater noster* wove together spiritual and temporal things.²⁸⁹ Some prayers balance the desire for things in this and the next life: one asks for assistance in the present life and then the rewards of eternal blessedness.²⁹⁰ Another asked that God help in this life and in eternal life.²⁹¹ The mysteries of the Eucharist are referred to as a present and future remedy.²⁹² This is sometimes phrased slightly differently – for instance, that the solemnity would confer the

²⁸⁵ Leontios of Neapolis, *Vie de Syméon le Fou; Vie de Jean de Chypre*, 375–6.

²⁸⁶ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, iii, 196. Also in Gregory I, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, 354 (sermon 37).

²⁸⁷ *Vie de Théodore de Sykéôn*, 100–102.

²⁸⁸ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, iii, 196, 198.

²⁸⁹ Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, 17–18.

²⁹⁰ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 297 (formula 790 [C]).

²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, i, 110 (formula 77 [PC]).

²⁹² *Ibid.*, i, 301 (formula 804 [PC]). On this theme, see E. Peterson, *The Angels and the Liturgy: The Status and Significance of the Holy Angels in Worship*, trans. R. Walls (London, 1964).

remedies of the present life and eternal rewards.²⁹³ The heavenly world is called upon to intervene directly in the course of the Mass. In a prayer said as the altar is dressed, the Holy Spirit is asked to descend upon the altar to make the gifts holy and cleanse the hearts of the people who receive.²⁹⁴ In some cases, the process to achieve the sacrifice and the benefits that issue from it are tied together. God is asked to sanctify the altar, receive the offering, and grant the people involved perpetual salvation.²⁹⁵

The strongest proof of the connection between the earthly and spiritual is the actions of angels and saints. Though they lived in heaven, petitioners could ask them to intercede on earth. An angel was thought to take the body and blood to the altar in paradise, where it was filled with heavenly blessing.²⁹⁶ Saints to whom prayers were addressed in the Mass were from the city of Rome or had a cult there.²⁹⁷ The prayers express the implicit belief that the saints could intercede to benefit the lives of people who prayed to them. The saints provided protection and aid on earth, and the fondest wish of the supplicant was to gain their society, presumably in heaven.²⁹⁸ In the prayer *Libera nos*, the Virgin Mary, Peter and Paul, Andrew, and other saints are requested to keep the petitioners free from sin and secure from all disturbance.²⁹⁹

The Gregorian Sacramentary contains a host of prayers that call upon the intercession of saints, asking them to serve as patrons to provide something from God. This can be seen in a concrete way in a small votive cross preserved from the archaeological dig at Crypta Balbi; it asks St Peter and St Augustus to protect their servant.³⁰⁰ A prayer for the intercession of a martyr asks that by this help, the petitioner would be freed from the terrors of anger and be granted mercy.³⁰¹ Gregory III created a special oratory within San Pietro in Vaticano in honor of Mary, and established prayers delivered to Mary at Mass in the oratory.³⁰² He not only dictated that these prayers be said in honor of Mary on the commemoration of her death, but also that they be inscribed into stones in

²⁹³ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 300 (formula 800 [C]).

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, i, 304 (formula 816).

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, i, 305 (formula 821).

²⁹⁶ *L'ordinaire*, 82.

²⁹⁷ V.L. Kennedy, *The Saints of the Canon of the Mass*, 2nd edn (Vatican City, 1963).

²⁹⁸ *L'ordinaire*, 78, 84.

²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 86.

³⁰⁰ *Roma dall'antichità al medioevo: Archeologia e storia nel Museo nazionale romano*, ed. M.S. Arena, P. Delogu, L. Paroli, M. Ricci, L. Sagui, and L. Vendittelli (Milan, 2001), 359. There are two brief inscriptions on the medallions of the cross, which share the same middle part ("Tu custodi"): "S(an)C(t)E/PETRE/TV/CVSTODI/FAM/VL(um)/T/VVM" and "A(nimu)M/MEV/M/TV/CVST/ODI/S(an)C(t)E/AVGV/STE."

³⁰¹ *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 345 (formula 1009).

³⁰² Mordek, "Rom, Byzanz und die Franken," 150–51.

the oratory. The prayers stress Mary's and the other saints' duty to rejoice in the faithful, protect them, defend them from dangers, grant them assistance, and help them experience eternal joys through celebrating the Eucharist.³⁰³

Angels and saints were present to assist humans, but spiritual enemies had to be combated. Demons remained a constant threat, but one that could be warded off by prayer. To be initiated in baptism, a child had first to undergo a process of exorcism in which the devil would be driven out and the child would be protected against demonic attack.³⁰⁴ In the seventh-century Greek miracle of St Anastasius, an Eastern community of monks drove a demon out from a young girl.³⁰⁵ The monks knelt, beat their heads on the ground, stretched their hands to heaven, prayed, chanted the Divine Office, cried out *Kyrie eleison*, and, finally, offered the possessed girl the Eucharist. Another possessed woman was freed from demons, partially due to attending Mass.³⁰⁶ During the performance of the Divine Office, a demon was expelled from the body of a man.³⁰⁷ Another procession accompanied by prayer drove out unclean spirits.³⁰⁸ A combination of a procession, prayers, and the presence of crosses helped to effect exorcisms.³⁰⁹ Greek prayers were written against people who were oppressed by unclean spirits or demons³¹⁰ and houses tormented by evil spirits.³¹¹

In one extraordinary story, a man observed a group of saints performing the Divine Office in the cathedral of Merida.³¹² They then summoned demons, who were charged to kill the pious sixth-century Bishop Fidel, so that he would become a martyr and join the saints in heaven. Two attempts on his life were unsuccessful, thwarted by the bishop's prayer and incense. Only when Fidel ceased could the demons kill him.

³⁰³ Ibid., 150–51.

³⁰⁴ See OR XI:5, 21, 22, 48, 84 (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 419, 422–3, 429, 443). Generally on this phenomenon, see H.A. Kelly, *The Devil at Baptism: Ritual, Theology, and Drama* (Ithaca, NY, 1985).

³⁰⁵ *Saint Anastase le Perse: et l'histoire de la Palestine au début du VII^e siècle*, ed. B. Flusin, 2 vols (Paris, 1992), i, 175–81 (Greek version); C.V. Franklin, *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian: Hagiographic Translations and Transformations*, Studies and Texts, 147 (Toronto, 2004), 355–60 (Latin version).

³⁰⁶ *Vie de Théodore de Sykéon*, 58–9.

³⁰⁷ Ibid., 76–7.

³⁰⁸ Ibid., 89–91.

³⁰⁹ Ibid., 38–9.

³¹⁰ *L'Eucologio Barberini Gr. 336*, 197 (formula 206, no. 2), 197 (formula 207, no. 2), 220 (formula 243, no. 2).

³¹¹ *L'Eucologio Barberini Gr. 336*, 230–31 (formula 257, no. 2).

³¹² *Vitas sanctorum patrum Emeretensium*, ed. A.M. Sánchez, CCSL, 116 (Turnhout, 1992), 41–4.

The sources agree that prayers of the Mass had a significant role in bringing people to heaven, but they also affirm that the Mass brings heaven to earth. The separation between the two realms breaks down completely during the course of the liturgy:

Who of the faithful can doubt that at the moment of the sacrifice at the voice of the priest the heavens are opened, in that mystery of Jesus Christ choirs of angels are present, the lowest united with the highest, earth is joined with heaven, one is made from the visible and invisible?³¹³

The Mass, and within the Mass the sacrifice, becomes the fulcrum between heaven and earth, and is the time when the two realms become one. In one sermon, Gregory urged people to hasten to celebrate the heavenly solemnity with the angels.³¹⁴ Although his listeners could not see the angelic festival, they could join them in desire and mind. As Gregory describes it at another point, the earthly liturgical celebration is a shadow of the heavenly celebration; attending Mass and feeling temporal joys made people's hearts burn for eternal joys.³¹⁵

Prayer and Gift-giving

To make sense of the role of prayer in Roman society, it is necessary to grapple with the burgeoning field of gift-giving. This area of academic inquiry has developed into a subject of interest for those studying Western Europe in the Middle Ages,³¹⁶ and among other contributions, has helped to clarify the mechanics of granting land to monasteries.³¹⁷ The first point of entry on gift-giving is the influential essay of Marcel Mauss, who described the highly ritualized system

³¹³ Gregory I, *Dialogi*, iii, 202: "Quis enim fidelium habere dubium possit ipsa immolationis hora ad sacerdotis uocem caelos aperiri, in illo Iesu Christi mysterio angelorum chorus adesse, summis ima sociari, terram caelestibus iungi, unum quid ex uisibilibus atque inuisibilibus fieri?"

³¹⁴ Gregory I, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, 179 (sermon 21).

³¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 226 (sermon 26).

³¹⁶ For three significant studies of gift-giving in medieval Europe, see *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context*, ed. E. Cohen and M.B. de Jong (Leiden and Boston, 2001); *Negotiating the Gift: Pre-modern Figurations of Exchange*, ed. G. Algazi, V. Groebner, and B. Jussen (Göttingen, 2003); *The Languages of Gift in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. W. Davis and P. Fouracre (Cambridge and New York, 2010).

³¹⁷ B.H. Rosenwein, *To be the Neighbor of Saint Peter: The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property, 909–1049* (Ithaca, NY, 1989), 125–32; S.D. White, *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints: The laudatio parentum in Western France, 1050–1150* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1988), 153–76.

of giving and receiving gifts and counter gifts in “primitive” societies.³¹⁸ Even as Mauss’ theories have come under attack from anthropologists, medievalists have borrowed liberally from them.³¹⁹ Most relevant here is Arnold Angenendt’s importation of Mauss’ ideas into the study of medieval liturgy.³²⁰ In a system he summarized as *do-ut-des*, the clergy would accept charity from the laity and then offer the sacrifice of the Mass on their behalf. In exchange for the gifts extended in sacrifice, those who sponsored the offering would get spiritual gifts – most prominently, salvation. This Angenendt characterized as an archaic system adopted from pre-Christian roots and distinct from early Christian conceptions of prayer.

Though once dominant in medieval European studies, Mauss’ model is no longer considered the only way to look at gift-giving, nor a theory valid across all cultures.³²¹ As one medievalist recently put it, few of Mauss’ specific findings hold up to scrutiny, and perhaps the most lasting contribution of his work is introducing scholars to the significance of the gift.³²² Angenendt’s arguments have not been immune from the reevaluation of Mauss’ ideas. In appropriating Mauss so straightforwardly, Angenendt neglects any of the more recent work on gift-giving.³²³ The schemes of Mauss and Angenendt focus narrowly on the simple act of exchange, likening it to a form of commerce. Other studies have complicated this picture by incorporating anthropological fieldwork. They focus attention on items in societies that either can never be exchanged or, if they are, are too closely connected with the identity of the giver to be truly alienated; and further, to the complex network of social relationships fostered by exchange.³²⁴ In the study of prayer, Angenendt’s conception of gift and counter gift have been further challenged. In a contribution that drew examples from across centuries, Bernhard Jussen claimed that medieval Europeans could offer gifts to God, but

³¹⁸ M. Mauss, *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, trans. I. Cunnison (New York, 1967).

³¹⁹ Rosenwein, *To be the Neighbor*, 125–32.

³²⁰ A. Angenendt, *Geschichte der Religiosität im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 1997), 373–8; *idem*, “*Donationes pro anima*: Gift and Counter gift in the Early Medieval Liturgy,” in *The Long Morning of Medieval Europe: New Directions in Early Medieval Studies*, ed. J.R. Davis and M. McCormick (Aldershot and Burlington, VT, 2008), 131–54.

³²¹ See especially G. Olgazi, “Introduction,” in *Negotiating the Gift*, 9–27.

³²² P.J. Geary, “Gift Exchange and Social Science Modeling,” in *Negotiating the Gift*, 129–40.

³²³ T. Head, “The Early Medieval Transformation of Piety,” in *Long Morning*, 155–60, at 158–9.

³²⁴ A.B. Weiner, *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping-while-Giving* (Berkeley, 1992); M. Godelier, *The Enigma of the Gift*, trans. N. Scott (Chicago, 1999).

they could not anticipate a countergift; anything they received from God only came as free and unmerited.³²⁵

How is it possible to make sense of the debates surrounding gift-giving when it comes to seventh- and eighth-century Rome? From the evidence that I have assembled in this chapter, it appears to me that it would be hasty to dismiss Angenendt's model too summarily, however controversial Mauss has become. The prayer texts, and the liturgical actions associated with them, all operate under the assumption that if humans extend gifts to God, the divinity will be bound to reciprocate with a countergift. As a result, Angenendt's central argument, *do-ut-des*, is confirmed by the primary sources. This is especially evident in the offertory, in which people offer the gifts of bread and wine to God and anticipate that God would reward them in turn.³²⁶ The papal sacramentary strikingly and succinctly describes the exchange taking place in the liturgy as "holy commerce."³²⁷ This term could be understood in a broader theological sense, referring to other exchanges between God and humans: for instance, God's becoming human allowed humans to become Godlike.³²⁸ Yet its concrete meaning in the context of the Mass was humans' offering up earthly goods in exchange for eternal life from God. There is no need to label this system as "primitive" or "archaic" – merely what best fits the evidence from Rome in the seventh and eighth centuries. A twofold exchange of gifts occurred at the Roman Mass, with the clergy serving as an intermediary between the two transactions. The laity gave bread and wine to the clergy; and the clergy then offered up the bread and wine with their prayers. The expected result was that God would reward both the initial and more immediate donors. In addition to the gifts like removing sin and granting salvation, God would also transform the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus. This was not an equal exchange: God's countergift dwarfed what humans were capable of offering.

Accepting this way of looking at the gift for Rome has implications for a treatment of the newer scholarly models of gift-giving. Though the theory of the existence of inalienable possessions and the concept of keeping-while-giving has developed as an attractive alternative to Mauss, at its heart this position simply

³²⁵ B. Jussen, "Religious Discourses of the Gift in the Middle Ages: Semantic Evidences (Second to Twelfth Centuries)," in *Negotiating the Gift*, 173–92.

³²⁶ D. Ganz, "Giving to God in the Mass: The Experience of the Offertory," in *Languages of Gift*, 18–32.

³²⁷ For discussion, see Ganz, "Giving to God in the Mass," 25. The phrase "sacrosancta commertia" is found in *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 100 (formula 37 [OSO]) and i, 199 (formula 419 [PC]); and "sancta commertia" in *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 144 (formula 214 [OSO]).

³²⁸ For an examination of the development of the term see, M.F. Herz, *Sacrum Commmercium: eine begriffsgeschichtliche Studie zur Theologie der römischen Liturgiesprache* (Munich, 1958), and specifically with reference to the Mass, 249–91, 316–20.

does not fit the evidence of early medieval Europe.³²⁹ Even the bread and wine of the Mass is alienated in the course of the Mass, although the mechanism of the exchange may not be immediately apparent. God accepts the gifts and then provides as a countergift the Eucharist. Since the bread and wine were changed in nature, they represented a new countergift. Jussen's argument, on the other hand, represents a normative theological position culled from examples over a long chronology; it ill suits the witness of medieval prayers, narrative sources, and letters.³³⁰ A careful reading of Jussen's own examples show that some of these contradict his argument.³³¹ Perhaps the desire to see Christianity as a "higher" religion that does not resort to negotiation with God or anticipate that God would deign to engage in a businesslike activity creates a hesitance to accept that this is how Christianity functioned, at least in parts of medieval Europe. There was indeed a special form of Christian gift-giving, but it related less to the impossibility of an exchange with God and more to some of the things that humans aimed at receiving from God – that is, spiritual gifts for the soul like forgiveness of sin and salvation.³³²

If there is a deficiency in Angenendt's argument about gift-giving in medieval liturgy, it is not the central characterization of this interaction as exchange, but rather the missing element of new relationships created by the process. Elite Romans provided the bread and wine for Communion in exchange for special recognition during the prayers of the Mass. This can be viewed as a form of late and attenuated euergetism, albeit with a Christian flavor.³³³ Noble Romans had been incorporated into positions of power within the Church, and their donations benefited the Church. Like ancient examples, these exchanges were part of founding and sustaining the high statuses lay elites enjoyed. Their reputation was secured because their generosity was intended for the benefit of the entire society. The transformed bread and wine were distributed widely, and

³²⁹ C. Wickham, "Conclusion," in *Languages of Gift*, 238–61, at 257–8. Certain provocative aspects of Weiner's evidence, like the dominant feminine exercise of power in some Oceanic gift exchanges, find no echo in the eternal city. Cf. Weiner, *Inalienable Possessions*, esp. 66–97.

³³⁰ Wickham, "Conclusion," in *Languages of Gift*, 243–5, 256.

³³¹ In Jussen, "Religious Discourses of the Gift," 176, Gregory I refers twice in his correspondence to his addressees as "putting God in their debt" (*deum debitorem facere*: Gregory I, *Registrum*, i, 71, 111). Jussen rejects these citations because they occur in Gregory's letters, not in his theological works. In Jussen "Religious Discourses of the Gift," 191, Jussen dismisses Amalar of Metz's reference to a gift/countergift exchange as anomalous.

³³² This form of Christian gift-giving has been studied for seventh- and eighth-century France. See P. Jobert, *La notion de donation: convergences, 630–750* (Paris, 1977), esp. 137–225.

³³³ A. Zuiderhoek, *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire: Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor* (Cambridge and New York, 2009).

the prayers and sacrifice were done for the spiritual benefit of everyone. This would be in marked contrast to later votive Masses, often offered for the benefit of a single soul.³³⁴

My study of the operation of prayer in early medieval Rome allows me to suggest a way in which prayer in this society differed from other examples that have been studied. The culture of prayer not only connected humans with one another but was responsible for orienting the city to God. Repeated prayer fostered a relationship between humans but also between humans and God. The message that comes across with insistence was that Romans were dependent upon God for nearly all significant things, whether temporal or spiritual. People entered into a new relationship with God through prayer, which could temporarily fulfill worldly needs but would extend to salvation and eternal life with God.

This last point merits further reflection and grounding in the sources. Although this relationship with God through prayer is implicit in many documents from early medieval Rome, idealized accounts of how the bond ought to work appear explicitly in some. One of the main praises given to Gregory II was his steadfast devotion to prayers and litanies; his biographer remarked that he trusted more in God and his connection to him through liturgies than in human beings.³³⁵ In some of the most striking imagery involving the relationship with God created through prayer, Gregory I interpreted the marriage song in the Biblical book Song of Songs as a description of the relationship between the bridegroom Jesus and the bride, the Church. The Church, portrayed in the image of a bride, prayed longingly for the arrival of her bridegroom and his instruction:

But however she who said, *Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth*, was seeking the presence of her spouse. The holy Church, sighing for the arrival of the Mediator of God and humans, for the arrival of the Redeemer, prays to the Father to send the Son and to enlighten it through his presence, so that he may address the same Church, no longer through the mouths of prophets but with his own mouth.³³⁶

³³⁴ Angenendt, "Missa specialis"; A.A. Häussling, *Mönchskonvent und Eucharistiefeier: eine Studie über die Messe in der abendländischen Klosterliturgie des frühen Mittelalters und zur Geschichte der Messhäufigkeit* (Münster, 1973), 243–7; C. Vogel, "Une mutation culturelle inexpliquée: Le passage de l'eucharistie communautaire à la messe privée," *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 54 (1980), 231–50.

³³⁵ LP (Duchesne), i, 406–7.

³³⁶ *Sancti Gregorii Magni Expositiones in Canticum canticorum, in librum primum Regum*, ed. P. Verbraken, CCSL, 144 (Turnhout, 1963), 14–15: "... sed tamen sponsi sui praesentiam quaerebat, quae dicit: *Osculetur me osculis oris sui*. Suspirans enim sancta ecclesia pro aduentu mediatoris dei et hominum, pro aduentu redemptoris sui, ad patrem uerba orationis facit, ut filium dirigat et sua illam praesentia inlustret, ut eidem ecclesiae non iam

This extended metaphor demonstrates the intimacy of the relationship between Jesus and the Church. This relationship was fostered through prayer even before Jesus' coming. The Church's fondest wish was to have Jesus appear again in the flesh to hear directly the words that had previously been communicated through the prophets. For Gregory, Jesus' sacrifice at the Crucifixion was not a singular event that ended the relationship: again and again through the sacrifice at the altar, he suffered for humans.³³⁷

If performed correctly, then, prayer had immense power in controlling the lives of early medieval Romans. Mundane and more spiritual desires were directed equally to God. Prayer was the recourse people had to beseech God's mercy and to bring an end to his anger so that he would wipe out sin and open the doors to salvation. As much as prayers could affect earthly relationships, they also oriented Romans to God and the hope of reuniting with him in heaven.

There is a final reflection to be made on the effect this culture that exalted prayer had on early medieval Rome. Because the sources as ever are rooted in the clerical sphere, it remains difficult to establish to what extent the larger lay audience accepted the culture of prayer they describe. If the ideas gained general currency, the prestige of the clergy, who were the impresarios of prayer, would have grown. It was their prayers that would provide for society's material and spiritual desires. They would be mediators for the people with God and secure his blessings for the city. This leadership in prayer was another of the features that would distinguish the clergy from average people and create new prestige for them. While prayer was available to all, the clergy were the main composers and performers of prayers, and they did so vicariously for their flock. Prayer was not an individualistic practice meant to save only the person praying, but was designed to preserve Christian society as a whole in difficult times, and in the process to gain the blessed afterlife of people's souls.

per prophetarum sed suo ore adlocutionem faciat." For a similar interpretation of the Biblical book, see Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, i, 220.

³³⁷ Gregory I, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, 354 (sermon 37).

Conclusion

Main Results of this Study

Even during the glory days of liturgical study, one senses frustration among some of its experts that their topic was not more broadly appreciated. The normally laconic Michel Andrieu (1886–1956), whose edition of the *ordines* facilitated all future discussion of early medieval liturgy, advocated for the world-changing importance of documents of worship. The rites of the Christian religion, he asserted, were every bit as worthy of study as the ancient Roman rituals of the Arval Brotherhood.¹ Josef A. Jungmann (1889–1975), who produced the standard work on the history of the Mass, knew that he was swimming against the tide when he declared that if there were any feature of past culture that merited intense study, it was the Mass.² Today, the history of the liturgy, far from being the most highly valued area of research, is viewed as esoteric, if not downright irrelevant to understanding anything that happened outside of churches. Jungmann's preface provides a hint as to why the history of liturgy is so summarily dismissed among many scholars today. He found self-evident the relevance of worship in the lives of his readership and the world in which his work was first published. Because liturgy does not have the same societal weight today, historians tend not to appreciate its significance in the past either. Focusing primarily on matters of interest to present concerns, however, severely restricts an ability to grapple with evidence. The recognition of how we differ from the subjects of our study should be the beginning, not the end, of historical inquiry. Our most interesting observations of the past start when we stop speaking for ourselves and hear what our historical actors are saying.³ The primary sources remind us that liturgy was serious business in the Middle Ages. When speaking about the pope and his clergy in the city of Rome and the many who imitated papal practices, passing over the liturgy is to omit a vital part of lived experience.

Liturgy is more than spectacle devoid of content or a pious business that was confined to churches. Worship accomplished concrete things in society. It is no mistake that in many cultures, ritual – while not unremittingly solemn – was

¹ *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, xv.

² Jungmann, *MS*, i, v.

³ M.D. Sahlins, *How "Natives" Think: About Captain Cook, For Example* (Chicago, 1995).

considered to be work.⁴ In fact, one of the constitutive elements of the etymology of the word liturgy is the Greek *ergon*, work. As I have suggested throughout this book, the liturgy was able to operate on several levels at the same time. The importance attributed to its design and execution comes across in the documents that describe the liturgy and the theology that attempts to parse its meaning. This was put into action with the considerable economic outlay that the papacy was willing to invest in them, resources that show how frequent liturgies were critical for papal self-representation.

The terse liturgical sources, especially the liturgical scripts the *ordines*, only hint at how elaborate and overwhelming papal liturgies in the seventh and eighth centuries must have been. The Mass was a multimedia spectacle that combined the aural presentation of music, readings, and prayer with the visual presentation of churches, decoration, and liturgical furnishings; these would have enhanced the primary focus on the action of the Mass. Other than aesthetic pleasure, the Mass would have communicated special respect to certain items and people, along with messages simple enough to be understood by the laity, such as belief in God and Jesus. The Mass, however, stopped short of incorporating a sermon or creed. The heavy use of visual media and plain chant would have especially appealed to those who could not hear the words or could not speak Latin. No attempt was made to explain the action of the Mass to the congregation. Although they did not play the main role, the laity was by no means restrained from taking an active part in the Mass. In effect, lay participation, along with other features like prayers being spoken out loud, suggest that the papal Mass in this period was more similar to ancient liturgies than to later medieval ones. It is tempting to deem aspects of the liturgy in this period lacking, but it is unfair to judge worship according to standards Romans at this time would not have recognized.

Liturgy had the capacity to organize people by directing their bodies. The Mass exalted the person of the pope above everyone else: he had the central role of the performance and was cordoned off from the rest of the congregation. Along with him, the clergy in the papal court was set apart from and raised above the rest of society. Gradations of rank within the clergy were set by their positions in the liturgy. Some indications hint that the liturgy was deliberately designed to avoid conflicts of precedence. At the same time, deacons and the minor clergy were constantly exalted, pushing away outsiders to the papal palace like priests and monks. As much as the liturgy made the people's ranks appear eternal, they were in reality tightly contested and ever changing. No one who saw any of these precise ballets of hierarchy would have any doubt about the clerical obsession for order.

⁴ V. Turner, "Variations on a Theme of Liminality," in *Secular Ritual*, ed. S.F. Moore and B.G. Myerhoff (Assen, 1977), 36–52, at 39–41.

The performance of the liturgy further allowed the clergy to interact with and order the lay world. The laity donated bread and was honored publicly in the prayers of the Mass for this contribution. The pope invited some of the elite to dine with him after the Mass. Communion was distributed to the laity in order of precedence, reinforcing previously existing societal distinctions. On a deeper level, the liturgy contributed to creating a series of binaries that divided and passed value judgments on the people in society: clergy and lay, men and women, upper and lower classes, behaving Christians and misbehaving Christians. Though these divisions are witnessed primarily in the experience of worship, they must have extended far beyond it. Women in particular were disadvantaged by a brand of ritual that gave them a limited role and distanced them from the sacrifice. When extending a gaze to papal interaction with the emperor in Constantinople, worship exposed the ambiguity of the relationship. As long as the pope was the subject of the emperor, he prayed for the emperor's success, but at the same time, he could exploit the liturgy's resources to protest imperial action.

Ironically, even as the liturgy divided people into groups or served to criticize the empire, it was also intended to forge societal unity. Its symbols and verbal expressions, and above all the Eucharist, created a sense that Romans were one people bound by worship. Certain actions, like kissing and sending consecrated bread out to churches in the city, were powerful expressions of a desire for unity. For some theologians like Maximus the Confessor (580–662), ritual also joined fellow worshippers on a higher, mystical level. The sense of unity sponsored by worship occurs across several cultures and may have biological roots. Coming together in worship meant submitting oneself to the clergy and the pope, the *de facto* ruler of the city. To attend his liturgies signified that one was allied with the pope and agreed with his teachings.

Celebrating the liturgy made demands on the clergy, namely that they refrained from sexual activity, but it gave them new rights to dictate the boundaries of the community. Liturgy, and especially baptism, became a basic entry into society and over a lifetime continued to provide a standard for what it meant to be a good Christian. Activity opposed by the clergy could be met with excommunication, literal deprivation of the Eucharist, but also preventing association with other Christians. Deviant forms of worship led to the condemnation of outsider groups, whether heretics, Jews, pagans, or magicians. Even orthodox Christians could find themselves in hot water for not behaving at Mass. This does not mean that everyone consented to the pope's wishes immediately or there would have been no need for letters to control his unruly flock. But it did mean that the papacy had established a ceremonial norm, one so powerful that in the eighth century Boniface was prepared to use it to criticize the papacy's inability to stamp out what he identified as pagan practice in the pope's own backyard.

The liturgy gave people a new access to God through prayer. When read carefully for what they reveal about mentalities, prayer texts show the recurrent presence and importance of prayer for Roman society. The liturgy assumed a belief in God, angels, and saints, and in their ability to influence the world. Though prayer could be essential in requesting protection from earthly enemies and controlling nature, it had a more crucial role in gaining divine mercy, cleansing the faithful from sin, and offering passage into heaven. Prayer provided a way for mortals to exert control over the supernatural world and its denizens like saints, angels, and demons, and to benefit their loved ones in the next life. Some of these prayers implied that saying them would allow any division between heaven and earth to collapse entirely. Humans' offering of gifts and prayer to produce God's blessings was an exchange, but it also fostered relationships among humans and with God. Whereas everyone benefited from prayer, it created a sense of dependence upon the clergy, who were the ritual experts and mediators with God.

Broader Implications of Studying Liturgy and Society

None of the contemporary sources would have underestimated the liturgy's power to negotiate relationships among humans and with God. Liturgy provided a framework for Romans to interpret and shape reality. Worship was not a private affair or restricted to small religious communities, but woven into the way that people understood their world and interacted with one another on a larger societal level. The pope and the clergy could use the liturgy as a political tool. Although reception of liturgies remains a difficult thing to gauge, the successful rise to power by the papacy and its ability to assert effective political control in the city of Rome were at least in part attributable to mastery of the liturgy.⁵ While not everyone in the society would have uniformly been affected by it, the extensive liturgical celebrations of the papacy would have been difficult to avoid. The sources convey the impression that the papacy had virtually monopolized the ritual sphere in the city of Rome. Only occasionally does one catch a glimpse of popular ritual that fell outside his control, like the "pagan" celebrations on New Year's Day. The power of the pope tempted others to compete for the prize of this office, but liturgy could be used to secure the position and quell factions.

One potential explanation for the dominant position of liturgy in Roman society is "political Augustinianism."⁶ This concept tried to make sense of the

⁵ T.F.X. Noble, *The Republic of St. Peter: The Birth of the Papal State, 680–825* (Philadelphia, 1984), 216–17.

⁶ H.X. Arquillière, *L'augustinisme politique; essai sur la formation des théories politiques du Moyen-Âge*, 2nd edn (Paris, 1955); D. Kries, "Political Augustinianism," in *Augustine through the*

extensive copenetration of “Church” and “State” in the Middle Ages by positing a breakdown of the boundaries that separated the natural and supernatural spheres. Elements of the theory describe the situation that held in Rome at this time: it is difficult to see much of a separation between the natural and supernatural in contemporary Rome, and salvation was indeed a motivating concern.⁷ Yet I would hesitate wholly to subscribe to this concept. Critics have dismissed “Augustinianism” as a myth that distorts medieval thought,⁸ having much more to do with the early-twentieth century when it was formulated than the Middle Ages.⁹ There are other reasons that the theory should not be applied indiscriminately to the liturgy. Its main application was legal: the natural law of the State melded with ecclesiastical law. Its author had little interest in liturgical texts, which according to him expressed Christian ideals that people already understood.¹⁰ “Augustinianism” was at its heart an intellectual construct that left no space for liturgical practice. It provided no explanation for the mechanism by which “Church” and “State” blended seamlessly.

Rather than conceiving of a society that was motivated by an intellectual ideal, it is more suitable to argue for a society in which liturgy was formative in creating new values. Attending and participating in the worship of Roman society would continually reinforce clerical leadership. While God was above his ministers on earth, they possessed the ability to commune with God to preserve society and gain a blessed afterlife. The genius of deploying liturgy as a strategy to reform society in the image of the clergy was that no one had to submit consciously to the “program” of clerical control of the city or be able to describe it in words. As one anthropological study has shown, those participating in ritual do not always verbalize the same idea of what is happening.¹¹ Ritual can create a special form of solidarity without consensus.¹² As long as people, by their participation or their passive presence, submitted to the new power constellation, they helped to make it real. Someone accustomed to the order created through the liturgy would find it “natural” and suppose that it had always existed.

The liturgy is influential precisely because it operates subtly, changing the world but making it seem that the order it established had always been. The

Ages: An Encyclopedia (Grand Rapids, MI, 1999), 657–8.

⁷ Arquillière, *L'augustinisme politique*, 54.

⁸ H. de Lubac, “Political Augustinism?” in *Theological Fragments*, trans. R.H. Balinski (San Francisco, 1989), 235–86.

⁹ B. Dufal, “Séparer l’Eglise et l’Etat: L’augustinisme politique selon Arquillière,” *L’atelier du Centre de recherches historiques*, 1 (2008), <http://acrh.revues.org/313>, accessed 1 March 2012.

¹⁰ Arquillière, *L'augustinisme politique*, 146.

¹¹ J.M. Fernandez, “Symbolic Consensus in a Fang Reformatory Cult,” *American Anthropologist*, N.S. 67 (1965), 902–29.

¹² C. Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (New York, 1992), 182–96; D.I. Kertzer, *Ritual, Politics, and Power* (New Haven, 1988), 37–76.

liturgical manifestations of the pope had developed over time, but by the seventh century they would have seemed to be firmly rooted “traditions.”¹³ Although it may seem incongruous at first, there is nothing to hinder us from observing that the liturgy promoted the societal position of the pope.¹⁴ This was not its only purpose, but it was surely one of them. In fact, if one were seeking a factor that continuously reinforced papal power, it may well be the liturgy. I find this more convincing than searching for continuity for the papacy in the “two swords theory,” or any ideological formulation of papal over secular authority.¹⁵ It makes little sense to cobble together a coherent intellectual theory from papal letters intended to respond to immediate problems or to suggest that the papacy had a master plan that they endeavored to carry out over a span of centuries.¹⁶ The kind of liturgy the papacy sponsored was more pervasive and powerful than any theory of its place in the world. The form of certain liturgies, even separated by centuries, is often strikingly similar.¹⁷ Popes maintained them precisely because they knew that they worked to perpetuate their exalted position.

Many will see the style of liturgy in this period as a sign of the ritualism of early medieval religion.¹⁸ It seems hard to deny that the clergy in this period primarily worried about the outward forms of worship. In contrast with later Christian traditions that focused more on theology, some would brand this as an inferior brand of religiosity. For the people of Rome of this time, orthopraxy was far more important than orthodoxy; liturgy was more important than theology.¹⁹ This is not to say that those who participated in the Mass did not believe, only that the depths of these beliefs were not always obvious in the outward form of

¹³ *The Invention of Tradition*, ed. E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger (Cambridge and New York, 1983).

¹⁴ For a cognate example, see A.K. McHardy, “Liturgy and Propaganda in the Diocese of Lincoln during the Hundred Years’ War,” *Studies in Church History*, 18 (1982), 215–27.

¹⁵ W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages: A Study in the Ideological Relation of Clerical to Lay Power*, 3rd edn (London, 1970).

¹⁶ For criticism of this model, see J. Richards, *The Popes and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages, 476–752* (London and Boston, 1979).

¹⁷ As Michel Andrieu argues (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 53), it is possible that the twelfth-century liturgical script the *ordo* of Benedict, which was later incorporated into the *Liber censuum*, used OR I:15–17 as one of its sources. See *Le liber censuum de l’Eglise romaine*, ed. P. Fabre and L. Duchesne, 3 vols (Paris, 1889–1952), ii, 152. It is impossible to know exactly whether Benedict had the text of OR I or another liturgical document that employed similar wording. What is remarkable, however, was that the papal liturgy of Easter Sunday was close enough in structure that someone who had first-hand knowledge of Rome’s liturgy could replicate similar wording to describe a ritual separated by centuries.

¹⁸ A. Angenendt, *Geschichte der Religiosität im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 1997), 351–5, 383–7.

¹⁹ C.M. Bell, *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions* (New York, 2009), 191–7; W.C. Smith, *Faith and Belief: The Difference Between Them* (Oxford, 1998), 13–15.

liturgies. This observation is true for many religious traditions, though others are not necessarily criticized for this difference.

The concern with the outer form of rites may not be fully appreciated because of a hesitance to speak about Western Europe in the same breath as anthropological cultures. It is unfortunate that one of the most widely known discussions of the Catholic Mass and anthropological ritual was written less as a disinterested comparison and more as a polemic against the liturgical reforms of the Mass at the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965).²⁰ A provocative recent book cautioned medievalists against importing anthropological material to investigate political ceremonial.²¹ Medieval narrative accounts should not be treated naively as a primitive form of fieldwork, and the context in which the descriptions were written must be taken seriously. While there has been a history of borrowing from anthropology in the study of the liturgy, there is no consensus on how best to do this and comparative study has only begun.²² Looking at Roman liturgy side by side with other ritual still has much to offer us. If one were to substitute the pope for the king, then the “theater state” of nineteenth-century Bali begins to look remarkably close to the Roman model: ceremonial in place of politics; power manifested through ritual rather than force; jostling for rank and prestige; and the king at the center because of ritual mastery.²³ My observations about ritual unity in society, commonplace in anthropological literature, have found little application or reflection in medieval history.

Looking to the Ritual Past and Future

As always with the papacy, the story I have told here has one foot in the ancient past and another in the medieval and modern futures. Ritual practices had

²⁰ V. Turner, “Ritual, Tribal and Catholic,” *Worship*, 50 (1976), 504–26. For criticism of Turner, see C. Bell, “Ritual, Change and Changing Rituals,” *Worship*, 63 (1989), 31–41. Bell argues that in the Mass, as with other rituals, social and historical changes result in modification of the rites themselves.

²¹ P. Buc, *The Dangers of Ritual: Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory* (Princeton, NJ, 2001).

²² M.D. Stringer, “Liturgy and Anthropology: The History of a Relationship,” *Worship*, 63 (1989), 503–21.

²³ C. Geertz, *Negara: The Theatre State in Nineteenth-Century Bali* (Princeton, 1980), esp. 120–36. For a previous study that associates Geertz’s work with the papacy, see P. Burke, “Sacred Rulers, Royal Priests: Rituals of Early Modern Popes,” in *Historical Anthropology of Early Modern Italy: Essays on Perception and Communication* (Cambridge and New York, 1987), 168–82, at 174, 182. It should be noted that there were prominent dissimilarities too: the king of Bali (unlike the pope) was viewed as divine and his cremation held the central position the Mass did in Rome.

a long and influential past in the ancient Roman world.²⁴ Love of ceremony, especially by the elite, forms one of the heritages of the ancient world, however it was reinterpreted in the early Middle Ages.²⁵ It is impossible to see the extent to which Christians borrowed from the pagan environment and how these rituals were modified when appropriated. But some broad similarities can be pointed out, such as the power and ubiquity that prayer enjoyed in the ancient Roman world²⁶ and the phrasing of Christian prayers modeled on pagan models.²⁷ Customs like the carrying of candles and incense in front of ancient Roman emperors or the wearing of vestments of imperial officials were overtaken and incorporated seamlessly into papal liturgy. No one would argue for continuity with the Roman system of ritual in all of its details, however.²⁸ Christianity was monotheistic and its prayers reflect that fact; it had a standard body of Scripture by the seventh century and exalted it in worship; it rejected animal sacrifice for the bloodless sacrifice of the Eucharist; and although both traditions requested things from the supernatural realm in prayer, Christianity aimed more at other-worldly salvation than did the pagan. For all of the borrowings of ancient Roman ritual, one had to be careful about overt appropriations from pagan world. This is why popes could be a *pontifex* in *ordines* but resisted the title *pontifex maximus* until the fifteenth century, since the latter was the head priest of the ancient Roman cult.²⁹ The same process of adapting the trappings of ancient Roman ritual took place simultaneously in Constantinople; ancient ceremonial would find a new home in the Byzantine rite.³⁰

The papal liturgy of OR I played a central part in the story of the papacy as an institution, and it had an equally determinant effect on the person of the

²⁴ See, for instance, *Ritual Dynamics and Religious Change in the Roman Empire*, ed. O. Hekster, S. Schmidt-Hofner, and C. Witschel (Leiden and Boston, 2009).

²⁵ M. McCormick, *Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium, and the Early Medieval West* (Cambridge, 1986), and *idem*, "Clovis at Tours. Byzantine Public Ritual and the Origins of Medieval Ruler Symbolism," in *Das Reich und die Barbaren*, ed. E.K. Chrysos and A. Schwarz (Vienna, 1989), 155–80.

²⁶ F.H. Hahn, "Performing the Sacred: Prayers and Hymns," in *A Companion to Roman Religion*, ed. J. Rüpke (Malden, MA, 2007), 235–48.

²⁷ R. Liver, *Die Nachwirkung der antiken Sakralsprache des lateinischen und italienischen Mittelalters: Untersuchungen zu den syntaktischen und stilistischen Formen dichterisch gestalteter Gebete von den Anfängen der lateinischen Literatur bis zur Dante* (Bern, 1979).

²⁸ For ancient Roman religion, see M. Beard, J. North, and S. Price, *Religions of Rome*, 2 vols (Cambridge and New York, 1998).

²⁹ I. Kajanto, "Pontifex maximus as the Title of Pope," *Arctos: Acta philologica fennica*, 15 (1981): 37–52.

³⁰ A. Rentel, "Byzantine and Slavic Orthodoxy," in *The Oxford History of Christian Worship*, ed. G. Wainwright and K.B. Westerfield-Tucker (Oxford and New York, 2006), 254–306, at 255–60.

pope and his relations with others. The papacy learned well the lessons of the early Middle Ages about ceremonial modes of exalting the pope, and regulating his relationships with the people in his entourage. The popes saw how the liturgy was fundamental to their connection with the people of the city of Rome. It is impossible to imagine the medieval papacy without taking into account the image popes projected to the city through the liturgy.³¹ Up until the time of the Avignon Papacy, the pope maintained the regular stational celebration of Masses in churches throughout the city of Rome. When the pope moved to Avignon in the fourteenth century, the ceremonies continued, but were simply moved within the walls of the palace.³² When the pope returned to Rome in the fifteenth century, most of his liturgies tended to be celebrated in San Pietro in Vaticano. Throughout the early modern period, ritual continued to be a constitutive part of the pope's power in Rome,³³ and mediated his relationships with Romans and visitors to the city.³⁴ If the liturgy was one of the prime means by which the medieval papacy would to some degree unify Europe,³⁵ this process began long before the reform papacy of the late-eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Even today, as the pope is confined to ruling over Vatican City, his power is rooted in his liturgical functions. With the advent of modern media, the rituals he leads have an effect reaching beyond those who can witness them in person or feel their immediate social effect. The liturgies of the pope are a subject of fascination for believers and non-believers alike, as the millions who watched the funeral Mass of Pope John Paul II (1978–2005) attest. One of the most significant parts of the modern pope's travels is holding huge public Masses.

³¹ M. Dykmans, *Le cérémonial papal de la fin du moyen âge à la renaissance*, 4 vols (Brussels, 1977–1985); B. Schimmelpfennig, "Die Bedeutung Roms im päpstlichen Zeremoniell," in *Rom in hohen Mittelalter. Studien zu den Romvorstellungen und zur Rompolitik vom 10. bis zum 12. Jahrhundert*, ed. B. Schimmelpfennig and L. Schmugge (Sigmaringen, 1992), 47–61; *idem*, *Das Papsttum: Von der Antike bis zur Renaissance*, 4th edn (Darmstadt, 1996); *idem*, *Die Zeremonienbücher der römischen Kurie im Mittelalter* (Tübingen, 1973); S.J.P. Van Dijk and J. Hazelden Walker, *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy: The Liturgy of the Papal Court and the Franciscan Order in the Thirteenth Century* (Westminster, MD, 1960).

³² S. de Blaauw, "Het ideaal van de stad als kerk. Verval en herleving van de Romeinse statieliturgie," in *Bouwkunst: Studies in vriendschap voor Kees Peeters* (Amsterdam, 1993), 77–86; B. Schimmelpfennig, "Die Funktion des Papstpalastes und der kurialen Gesellschaft im päpstlichen Zeremoniell vor und während des Schismas," in *Génèse et débuts du Grand Schisme d'Occident 1362–1394 (Avignon 25–28 septembre 1978)* (Paris, 1980), 317–28.

³³ Dykmans, *Cérémonial papal*; *Werte und Symbole im frühzeitlichen Rom*, ed. G. Wassilowsky and H. Wolf (Münster, 2005).

³⁴ Burke, "Sacred Rituals."

³⁵ G. Tellenbach, "Die Bedeutung des Reformpapsttums für die Einigung des Abendlandes," *Studi Gregoriani*, 2 (1947), 125–49, at 133–5.

The ceremonial modes of creating and manifesting power, introduced in Late Antiquity, and perfected in medieval Rome, continue to serve the papacy.

Papal liturgies would help to reinforce ritual modes of thinking and interacting in the rest of the Middle Ages. One need look no further than the Carolingian Age, often viewed as the high point for early medieval culture. Liturgy held a central place in the Carolingian program of reform: there was an effort to ensure its correct performance by priests and its ability to communicate doctrine to the faithful.³⁶ Litanies would provide a method for people in the Carolingian realm to demonstrate their loyalty to the king and aid in the war effort.³⁷ Popes began to say their own prayers for Charlemagne's well-being.³⁸ Liturgical chant was even a personal interest of Charlemagne: he ordered the translation of several Greek liturgical chants into Latin.³⁹ After his death, Charlemagne would become the subject of his own liturgical cult.⁴⁰

Several of the ritual emphases operative in Rome would have long afterlives. Lay rulers no less than clerical ones would recognize the power that ceremonial had to project their power.⁴¹ In some cases, Roman liturgical elements would be borrowed for use in royal ritual: the anointing of Roman confirmation reappeared in the anointing of kings.⁴² Prayers for the dead would become fundamental to medieval religiosity.⁴³ Features of the liturgy would remain vital in combating heresy. Late medieval priests began to elevate the host after the consecration to exalt the presence of Jesus in the Eucharist in opposition to heretical groups that

³⁶ R. McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789–895* (London, 1977), 115–54.

³⁷ M. McCormick, "The Liturgy of War in the Early Middle Ages: Crisis, Litanies, and the Carolingian Monarchy," *Viator*, 15 (1984), 1–23.

³⁸ J.A. Jungmann, "Flectere pro Carolo rege," in *Mélanges en l'honneur de Monseigneur Michel Andrieu* (Strasbourg, 1956), 219–28.

³⁹ J. Lemarié, "Les antiennes 'Veterem hominem' du jour d'octave de l'Épiphanie et les antiennes d'origine grecque de l'Épiphanie," *Ephemerides liturgicae*, 72 (1958), 3–38; J. Handschin, "Sur quelques tropaires grecs traduits en latin," *Annales musicologiques*, 2 (1954), 27–60; E. Nowacki, "Constantinople–Aachen–Rome: The Transmission of *Veterem hominem*," in *De Musica et Cantu: Studien zur Geschichte der Kirchenmusik und der Oper. Helmut Huke zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. P. Cahn and A.K. Heimer (Hildesheim and New York, 1993), 95–135.

⁴⁰ R. Folz, *Études sur le culte liturgique de Charlemagne dans les églises de l'Empire* (Paris, 1951).

⁴¹ E.H. Kantorowicz, *Laudes regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Mediaeval Ruler Worship* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1946).

⁴² A. Angenendt, "Rex et sacerdos: Zur Genese der Königssalbung," in *Tradition als historische Kraft: Interdisziplinäre Forschungen zur Geschichte des früheren Mittelalters*, ed. N. Kamp and J. Wolasch (Berlin and New York, 1982), 100–18.

⁴³ M. McLaughlin, *Consorting with Saints: Prayer for the Dead in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca, NY, 1994).

denied this doctrine.⁴⁴ For centuries afterwards, worship reflected the gradations of lay society but also forged solidarity.⁴⁵ The Eucharist would grow into an all-important symbol of Christian society, embodied by the celebration of the liturgical feast Corpus Christi.⁴⁶ Communion would become so fundamental to conceptions of societal unity that it was traumatic for many when Calvinist reformers rejected the Eucharist as a unifying symbol of Western Europe.⁴⁷

This study started with the struggles of Pope Martin I (649–655), and it is only fitting to end with him as well. At the outset, the role of worship in his last days seemed to make little sense; by this point, it should be seamlessly understood in a society that privileged expressions of worship. If Martin prayed for his safe return to Rome, he was to be disappointed. After his abduction, he was never to return to the eternal city or celebrate another Mass in its famous churches. In a certain fashion, however, he was to return to at least one of its houses of worship. An eighth-century fresco that depicted Martin I was painted in Santa Maria Antiqua, which is located in the Roman Forum.⁴⁸ He would surely have been pleased to have been depicted in the center of the early medieval city, but even more so in the presbytery of a structure devoted to the liturgy. Although the church has not been used for liturgy since the early Middle Ages, one of its other extant frescoes still features a Roman kneeling in prayer.⁴⁹ Like so much of early medieval Rome, this church disappeared completely for centuries, only to be excavated in 1900, and scholars are still working to interpret its eloquent witness. Uncovering this image of Martin I or any evidence of the past is only the first part of writing history. When what the sources reveal is strange and unanticipated, like a world in which liturgy played an extensive role, it takes years to make sense of it. Discovery means that we are only at the beginning.

⁴⁴ G.G. Grant, "The Elevation of the Host: A Reaction to Twelfth Century Heresy," *Theological Studies*, 1 (1940), 228–50.

⁴⁵ K. Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (New York, 1971), 151–4.

⁴⁶ M. Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge and New York, 1991).

⁴⁷ C. Elwood, *The Body Broken: The Calvinist Doctrine of the Eucharist and the Symbolization of Power in Sixteenth-Century France* (New York, 1999).

⁴⁸ *Santa Maria Antiqua al Foro Romano cento anni dopo: atti del colloquio internazionale, Roma, 5–6 maggio 2000*, ed. J. Osborne, J. Rasmus Brandt, and G. Morganti (Rome, 2004); P.J. Nordhagen, *The Frescoes of John VII (A.D. 705–707) in S. Maria Antiqua in Rome* (Rome, 1968), plates 49–50 for the image; H. Belting, "Eine Privatkapelle im frühmittelalterlichen Rom," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 41 (1987), 55–69.

⁴⁹ N. Teteriatnikov, "For whom is Theodotus Praying? An Interpretation of the Program of the Private Chapel in S. Maria Antiqua," *Cahiers archéologiques*, 41 (1993), 37–46.

This page has been left blank intentionally

Appendix 1

Rereading Michel Andrieu's Edition of the First Roman Ordo¹

Study of the First Roman Ordo (OR I) is only made possible by the painstaking editorial work undertaken by Michel Andrieu.² Creating a standard edition of this document is an especially difficult task, because while the original copy issues from a city in which Latin was still a living, spoken language, most of the monks who copied it consciously or unconsciously sought to “improve” the text based upon the norms of the classical language as seen from the educational program of the Carolingian Reform.³ One of the benefits of Andrieu's edition was that he recorded the many variants of the MS tradition in his critical apparatus.⁴ Some of these variants differed so greatly from the readings in the best MSS that he set them aside in separate columns or brackets in his edition. His retention of the variants allows one to follow the transformation of a medieval document as scribes copied and recopied it. Yet it raises a problem for future research. A precise grasp of language is imperative to an understanding of liturgical practice and thought.⁵ It is necessary to decide which set of variants one favors in order to reconstruct the shape of the liturgy when OR I was composed. It will not do

¹ The standard reference work for medieval Latin is P. Stotz, *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft zweite Abteilung, fünfter Teile*, 5 vols (Munich, 1996–2004). For liturgical Latin, see D. Sheerin, “The Liturgy,” in *Medieval Latin: an Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*, ed. F.A.C. Mantello and A.G. Rigg (Washington, DC, 1996), 157–82. For the editorial norms I adopt, see L. Havet, *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins* (Paris, 1911).

² *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 1–112. When referring to chapters of OR I, I give the chapter number (e.g., OR I:1). When indicating disputed points in Andrieu's edition, I give the page in his edition after the chapter number, and when helpful, the line (ln.) or lines (lins.), and column (left or right). In addition, when referring to variants that Andrieu lists at the bottom of his pages, I refer to both the note (n.) and the variant (var.). Finally, when I cite Andrieu's notes that occur apart from his section on variants at the bottom of the page, I cite the page number and distinguish them as an editor's note (ed. n.).

³ E. Löfstedt, *Late Latin* (Oslo, Aschehoug, and Cambridge, MA, 1959), 3–9.

⁴ *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, vii–xii.

⁵ W. Dürig, “Die Erforschung der lateinisch-christlichen Sakralsprache. Ein Bericht über den gegenwärtigen Stand der liturgie-theologischen Philologie,” *Liturgisches Jahrbuch*, 1 (1951), 32–47.

to make tentative statements about certain liturgical actions because they appear in some MSS but not others, or at times to accept the variants of a particular MS and at other times to reject them, depending upon the kind of point one hopes to make about the liturgy.⁶ It is necessary at least to bracket off those variants that as best as can be known do not correspond to the original state of OR I before its departure from Rome – those parts that were interpolated or substantially revised. Andrieu's detailed notes allow one to identify certain points where one might disagree with his editorial decisions. Throughout this appendix I have deviated from Andrieu's edition only in cases in which I think it is significant for the wording or sense of the document. For readings on which I remain uncertain, I have accepted the main text of his edition as standard. Many of my comments here simply reinforce Andrieu's own editorial decisions (or suspicions) as regards interpolations or variants, but it will be helpful to compile them here. I have taken two MSS into special consideration: the early ninth-century MS Wolfenbüttel, Landesbibliothek 4175 (W) and the late- ninth-century MS Albi, Bibliothèque municipale 42 (Y).⁷ These MSS were produced independently of the two great collections of *ordines* containing OR I, the alpha and beta families.⁸ Though Y is a consummate product of the Carolingian Renaissance in which one would expect to find classically correct Latin, it preserves many irregular formulations.⁹ Although only a fragment of it is now preserved, MS Bern, Burgerbibliothek 289 (H) has valuable readings. The most significant decision is how one is to deal with the readings of MS St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 614 (G), which contains what Andrieu identifies as the "shorter redaction" of OR I.¹⁰ This MS is anomalous for two reasons: (a) it entirely omits the first 23 chapters of OR I, which are included in the rest of the MS tradition; and (b) it has many variants for the chapters it includes, many of which are so distinct from the rest of the tradition that they are printed in Andrieu's edition in separate columns or bracketed off. Hours of research with Andrieu's edition of this work and my own examination of the MS in St. Gall, Switzerland have convinced me that G is indeed a central and complex testament to OR I. In spite of this, I doubt that it was ever an independent, shorter version of OR I. It is more plausible to argue that only one redaction of OR I ever traveled north

⁶ For an example of this looseness of method, see V. Saxer, *Sainte-Marie-Majeure: une basilique de Rome dans l'histoire de la ville et de son église, V^e-XIII^e siècle* (Rome, 2001), 122–3.

⁷ Cf. E.A. Lowe, *Codices latini antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century*, 11 vols (Oxford, 1934–1971), vii, 7. Lowe dates the latter to either the eighth or ninth century.

⁸ *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 21–2.

⁹ A. Wilmart, "La lettre philosophique d'Almanne et son contexte littéraire," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, 3 (1928), 285–320, at 286–92.

¹⁰ Many of G's variants are also found in other MSS directly dependent upon it, esp. MS St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 140 (A) and MS St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 446 (B).

of the Alps, and the differences found in the MS tradition are better explained as by-products of transmission rather than the multiple editions having being carried north of the Alps.

The scribe who copied G seems to have been consulting a defective MS, which explains why 23 of the original chapters of OR I went missing. A mutilated manuscript would explain the scribe's omission of the phrase of *ut supra diximus* (as we said before) in OR I:24, because he lacked the material referred to. In addition, in OR I:25 he inserted *a sella eius* (from his seat/saddle) to spell out from where the pope descends. This was superfluous in the original since the chapters he lacked established that the pope was riding on a horse. What is more, either the MS from which G was copying or G itself shows evidence of active interaction with the text as it was set down on parchment. As a result, G introduced variants that differ from the rest of the tradition, not because it is an older Roman version but because of scribal reworking of the text.

This is not to say that all of G's readings should be rejected. I accept many of Andrieu's readings that are based upon G, and in some of my criticism of Andrieu's edition below, I draw upon G. Still, I am skeptical of accepting most of G's idiosyncratic readings that diverge from the rest of the MS tradition, those that change the wording or the more substantive sense of the original. As a result, I will omit occurrences in which G departs from the rest of the MS tradition in my presentation of OR I.

In addition to the variants of G, there are 26 other cases in which Andrieu's edition merits further commentary.

1. OR I:7 (p. 70, lns. 2–3; n. 7 var. 14): I read Andrieu's *praecedunt* as *procedunt*. Andrieu has already noted that this was almost certainly a mistake in the original,¹¹ but left it in his edition. It appears in Y and W. Strikingly, Y's scribe faithfully recorded this tradition, but immediately felt uncomfortable with it: he inserted *ante ipsum* before *pontificem* to preserve the sense of the sentence.
2. OR I:15 (p. 72, ln. 7; n. 18, var. 4): Y contains the invariable form *solido uno* instead of *solidum unum*. Andrieu himself thought that this variant most likely existed in the original.¹² A later hand corrected non-classical formulation in Y, but the first hand faithfully transmitted the tradition.
3. OR I:28 (p. 76, ln. 8; n. 28, var 8): Although it does not intuitively seem likely, the correct reading for *aquamanus* should be *aquammanus*. This is suggested by the readings of Y (*aquammanus*) and G (*aquam ad manus*). This would explain G's variant as well as *aquam in manu*

¹¹ *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 35 n. 1.

¹² *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 35 n. 1.

in ABEV¹⁻³, both rationalized spellings in response to an unfamiliar form. The entry *aquammanus* does appear in Du Cange, though OR I:28 is the only passage cited that contains it.¹³ This form is comparable to one of the spellings of the more popular word for the same item, *aquaemanile*.¹⁴ Here, too, *aqua* is declined even though it is not at the end of the word. In addition, the accusative of *vicedominus* is given as *vicedomini* in OR I:99, a reading Andrieu accepted in his edition.

4. OR I:28 (p. 76, ln. 12): This chapter should end with a period rather than a comma.
5. OR I:36 (p. 79, lns. 8–9; n. 36, var. 24): *Respondet* is a secondary addition. As in the unchangeable prayers of the Mass,¹⁵ clear directions are not always given as to who must say responses or even when a statement ends and the response begins. It is missing in G, H, and Y. W improvised *et omnes respondent* to complete the sense.
6. OR I:44 (p. 81, lns. 9–10): Andrieu identifies these lines as an interpolation, and scrutiny of the MS tradition and internal coherence of the text confirm his judgment.¹⁶ They do not appear in W, Y, G, or H, and disrupt the action of the chapter – i.e., one suddenly learns of the subdeacons' actions in the middle of directions regarding the introit and the deacons' reaction to it. This custom may well be Roman,¹⁷ but it was not part of the original form of OR I.
7. OR I:52 (p. 84, lns. 2–5): As Andrieu argued,¹⁸ these lines are almost certainly an interpolation. They break up the sense of the chapter, which is primarily focused on the *schola*.
8. OR I:54 (p. 85, lns. 5–21): This entire chapter is an interpolation. The direction *si tempus ... tollantur* only appears in one MS, R, which is not generally considered a reliable MS.¹⁹ Although not part of the original Roman liturgy of OR I, it demonstrates that by c.825, when this MS

¹³ C. Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitas*, ed. L. Favre, 10 vols (Graz, 1954 [1883–1870]), i, 345.

¹⁴ A. Blaise and H. Chirat, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens*, 2nd edn (Paris, 1954), 93.

¹⁵ *L'ordinaire*, 58–92.

¹⁶ *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 81 n. 44.

¹⁷ J. Dyer, "The Schola Cantorum and its Roman Milieu in the Early Middle Ages," in *De Musica et Cantu: Studien zur Geschichte der Kirchenmusik und der Oper. Helmut Huckle zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. P. Cahn and A.K. Heimer (Hildesheim and New York, 1993), 19–40, at 34 n. 60.

¹⁸ *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 84 n. 52.

¹⁹ *Les Ordines Romani*, i, 232–8.

was copied, some kind of *laudes* were likely to have existed.²⁰ The rest of the chapter only appears in the beta group. Andrieu demonstrated²¹ that this section also includes a contradiction with the original text of OR I, in which the deacons had already removed their chasubles.²²

9. OR I:55 (p. 86, lns. 3–5): The phrase *Tunc ... sedeant*, missing from W and the beta group, is an interpolation. It breaks up the sequence of OR I:55–56, in which first the actions of the regionary subdeacons in general are described, and then it turns immediately to the subdeacon who is to read. It was most likely added to the MS tradition at some point by a rationalizing editor who observed that the bishops and priests are seated in OR I:56, and wanted to give them a pretext for having done so. The reading of W on the right side (*Tamen ... tempus*) is also an interpolation. It breaks up the action of the chapter, in which the regionary subdeacons come up to the altar in order to read the epistle. Finally, it runs entirely against the spirit of the document, in which people are rigidly placed into different duties, not switched midway through the ceremony. W's reading most likely preserves a tradition post-dating the original form of OR I.
10. OR I:57 (p. 86, lns. 11–16 [S]): The reading in the right-hand column, that of S (*ascendens ... sufficiet*), was not in the original version. It only appears in S, an MS that is often given to imaginative and even elegant reworkings of the original text.²³ Because this is the only MS that has this version of the chapter, it is unclear if anywhere it was the custom for there to be a second cantor who delivered the *Alleluia*.²⁴
11. OR I:58 (p. 87, lns. 1–8): The entire Chapter 58 is an interpolation, as Andrieu argued.²⁵ It only appears in the beta group, and shares the concern of the interpolations from this family with the liturgical vestment the chasuble (*planeta*).²⁶
12. OR I:59 (p. 87, lns. 10–14): Perhaps based upon G's silence at this point, Andrieu argued that the different variants on lines 10–13, as

²⁰ B. Schimmelpfennig, "Die Bedeutung Roms im päpstlichen Zeremoniell," in *Rom in hohen Mittelalter: Studien zu den Romvorstellungen und zur Rompolitik vom 10. bis zum 12. Jahrhundert*, ed. B. Schimmelpfennig and L. Schmugge (Sigmaringen, 1992), 47–61, at 57.

²¹ *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 85 ed. n. 54.

²² OR I:47.

²³ *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 20–21.

²⁴ This reading is mentioned by J. McKinnon, *The Advent Project: The Later-seventh-century Creation of the Roman Mass Proper* (Berkeley, 2000), 249, and incorporated fully into the reconstruction of R. Crocker, *An Introduction to Gregorian Chant* (New Haven, 2000), 116.

²⁵ Andrieu prints it in small characters, indicating that he thinks it is from another *ordo*.

²⁶ Cf. OR I:44 (p. 81, ln. 9); OR I:54 (p. 85; ln. 19); OR I:58 (p. 87; lns. 5 and 8).

well as “*Dominus ... Deinde*” were interpolations.²⁷ If this were true, however, it would be virtually impossible based upon Andrieu’s stemma to explain how both the alpha and beta groups of MSS both ended up with the same reading. Accepting these lines as genuine leaves one with the unenviable task of explaining how none of the four best MSS (G, H, Y, and W) arrived at this exact reading. First, aside from G, all the MSS have “*Dominus ... Deinde.*” That G should have decided to omit this part and further cut “*et tacite ... pontifex*” should not surprise us given its tendency to edit out liturgical details. The reading “*et tacite ... pontifex*” appears to best represent the original version of the text. W received this tradition, but changed its wording. The common ancestor of H and Y modified the laconic original, showing that the deacon received a blessing, being crossed by the pope.

13. OR I:60 (p. 88, lns. 9–13): The entire chapter is an interpolation, as Andrieu established.²⁸ It breaks up the connection between OR I:59 and 60, in which the subdeacons are mentioned, and then the actions of one specific subdeacon are described.
14. OR I:63 (p. 89, ln. 7; n. 63, var. 4): The *Resp.* was probably not in the original. It is omitted in Y and H. It is not necessary for the sense. Often, any indication that there was a new speaker was suppressed among the invariable prayers of the Mass.²⁹
15. OR I:66 (p. 90, lns. 6–7): The entire chapter is an interpolation. It only appears in the beta family of MSS, and continues its pattern of additions concerning candelabra.³⁰
16. OR I:67 (p. 90, ln. 11): The possessive adjective *suo* is omitted in Y and G, and was most likely omitted in the original as well. The MSS are my major rationale for this decision, since parallel passages do not resolve the problem completely: two of them show that there was no need to include the possessive adjective *suum* when the adjective *sinistrum* was used with the arm,³¹ but one includes both adjectives.³² Still, the first two passages I cite are similarly constructed as part of a prepositional phrase with *in*.

²⁷ *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 25 n. 5 and 30 n. 4.

²⁸ *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 25. OR I:59–60 represent the only two chapters in which Y or his source either made significant changes or interpolated material. Perhaps this was a point of particular interest to Y or his source?

²⁹ *L'ordinaire*, 58–92.

³⁰ Cf. OR I:52 (p. 84, ln. 2); and OR I:54 (p. 85, ln. 6 [left]). *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 143.

³¹ OR I:32 (*in sinistro brachio*); OR I:37 (*in sinistro brachio*).

³² OR I:61 (*brachium suum sinistrum*).

17. OR I:68 (p. 90, lns. 14–16): Andrieu was convinced that these lines were an interpolation,³³ but upon closer examination, this judgment is questionable. The inclusion or exclusion of this passage was one of the major criteria by which he established the MS stemma, but one could accept the validity of this aspect of the stemma without claiming the MSS that omitted it represent the original version of OR I. It is included in Y and the MSS of the alpha family, and for this reason, Andrieu argued that the scribe of their common (but lost) ancestor, y, must have inserted these lines. But the possibility exists that this ancestor did not insert these lines, but faithfully transmitted them from the original text – something that the MS lambda did not transmit to the MSS that depended upon it. For Andrieu, G was the guarantor of whether or not something was in the original Roman version, which may be part of the reason he rejected these lines. But if this rule of thumb is taken away, there appears to be no hindrance to accepting them as genuine. In fact for OR I:98–9, in a situation in which a passage was missing from G and the beta family, he argued that this passage was omitted because it did not correspond to any custom outside of Rome.³⁴ The same logic could apply to OR I:68 as well.

Furthermore, the logic of the document not only does not contradict, but supports, the inclusion of these lines. OR I gives no indication that the group that ascended to the pope's seat – the *primicerius*, *secundicerius*, *primicerius* of the *defensores*, the regionaries, and the notaries – was doing anything else that would exclude their action here. In addition, OR I:69 provides us with a rationale why the group approached the pope's seat: the *primicerius* of the notaries and the *primicerius* of the *defensores* would take the pope's hands in the *sustentatio* so he could receive offerings. Presumably the other members that ascended would also descend with the pope, though only two of them could hold his hands. This pattern repeats itself later in the text. In OR I:98 the same group of ministers ascends the altar again, so that the *primicerius* of the notaries and the *primicerius* of the *defensores* were ready to descend with the pope in the *sustentatio* in OR I:113 when the pope distributed Communion to those in the *senatorium*.

18. ORI:73 (p. 91, ln. 16; n. 73, var. 4): The word *amulas* appears in brackets in Andrieu's edition, as it only appears in the beta family of MSS. This is the same family that already produced several interpolations, and I am doubtful that it ever appeared in OR I. In fact, the author of OR I most likely simply slipped in this spot, leaving out any word at all. He

³³ *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 23–4; 90 ed. n. 68; 99 ed. n. 98.

³⁴ *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 99 ed. n. 98–9.

may have intended to imitate the form of the sentences in OR I:71–2, in which the thing received precedes the verb *suscipit*, but was confused by the relatively long title of the deacon and accidentally omitted the direct object. Most later copyists, following the lead of OR I, left this word out as well. A rationalizing editor at some point, however, decided to fill in the blank with the choice that seemed best to fit the context.

This, of course, creates a new problem: What word did the author *intend* to use, even if he left it out? This is a case in which the logic of the text assists us. In OR I:70 the *amulae* were already emptied, seemingly with the sole exception of the pope's special *amula*.³⁵ In fact, OR I:70 informs us of the proper order of pouring liquids: from the *amulas* to the *calix*, which is emptied into the *sciffus* when it is full. This order is imitated in part when the *fons* received from the *archiparafricanista* is also emptied into the chalice. In OR I:73, it appears that the archdeacon actually follows the order that had already been set out, receiving the chalice and emptying it into the bowls. This further makes sense in the context of the text: as in OR I:79, the pope's vessel is also poured (with a strainer) into the chalice. The chalice would need to be empty before it could receive new liquid. Thus, my suggested emendation for *amulas* is *calicem*.

19. OR I:107 (p. 101, lns. 15–16): The reading *calice ... dicendo* should be adopted as standard. This is supported by the best MSS. The other reading requires the pope to put the piece of consecrated bread he bit into the hands of the archdeacon, which hardly seems likely. The reason it was most likely edited out in other texts is because of the uniqueness of the Roman custom of inserting the consecrated bread twice in the chalice, something remarked upon by Amalar of Metz.³⁶ Although OR I includes few prayers, the author of OR I makes an exception in this case. This is possibly because the *commixtio* prayer was not a standard Mass prayer,³⁷ and might constitute an innovative liturgical element.
20. ORI:108 (p. 102, lns. 9–11): As Andrieu notes,³⁸ this is an interpolation. It only appears in W. While it most likely originated in an authentic Roman document – it refers to the difference between the intramural and extramural churches in the city of Rome – it fits awkwardly in this segment of OR I. In the middle of a sentence describing the actions of the archdeacon, it gives an entire speech (including a response).

³⁵ OR I:79.

³⁶ Amalar of Metz, *Amalarii episcopi opera liturgica omnia*, ed. J.M. Hanssens, *Studi e testi*, 138–40 (Vatican City, 1948–1950), ii, 363. Cf. *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 101 ed. n. 107.

³⁷ Cf. *L'ordinaire*, 58–92; and *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, i, 85–92.

³⁸ *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 102, ed. n. 108.

21. OR I:109 (p. 103, ln. 1): The phrase *omnes ascendunt*, though omitted entirely in 10 MSS, is included in W and Y, and was most likely in the original.
22. OR I:114 (p. 104, lns. 5–7): The phrase *populum ... pontifici* is a difficult one in that it largely forces us to choose between the two branches of the stemma of MSS of OR I.³⁹ It is tempting to eliminate this passage, especially since it already seems that from OR I:116 that the priests would be offering the bread and wine to the people. Yet the question then arises: To whom would the bishops be offering Communion? The passage cannot be construed as “the bishops (themselves) receive Communion,” as they already received from the pope in OR I:108. It seems that this is a case in which OR I was inexact about the term *populus*. Both the bishops and the priests give Communion to different segments of the *populus*. The group is distinct from those who are in the elite ranks in the *senatorium* or the *pars mulierum*, to whom the pope gives the consecrated bread. There is most likely a difference in societal rank between those people to whom the bishops and priests distribute the consecrated bread, both separated in their place in church, the order in which they are listed, and the ranks of the clergy who attend to them. In short, the inexactitude of the term *populus* is a problem of OR I, not a later editorial difficulty.
23. OR I:117 (p. 105, lns. 14–17): The decision one must make in this chapter is whether or not the *schola* chanted the *Gloria patri* after the Communion antiphon. It is my opinion that they did. This detail is included in G, W, and Y. The *schola* also chanted the *Gloria patri* at the end of the entrance antiphon in OR I:50–51, and the author of OR I used similar language in this case. The only problem in including these lines of OR I:117, however, is the question of OR I:122. Why is it that the author tells us twice that the *Gloria patri* needs to be chanted after everyone has received Communion, but before the final prayer? Is it possible that this redundancy means that one of these passages is a later insertion? It seems to me instead that both are authentic. *Gloria patri* was not, in fact, chanted twice; the chanting of it was instead described two different ways. The first of the two passages focuses primarily on the actions of the pope and *schola*; the second reveals what the process is by which the *schola* is informed that it is to start chanting the *Gloria patri*. There is no contradiction in the two passages, but they rather complement one another. Just as in OR I:50, it is the prior of the *schola* through whom the pope's wishes to start the music are mediated. The

³⁹ *Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 27.

reason why these lines were eliminated from some of the MSS is that they must have seemed to be an unfamiliar custom.

24. OR I:118 (p. 106, lns. 1–3): This passage is an interpolation. First, it is clear it is a later addition, because (a) W is the only text that expanded upon the seemingly mistaken idea about stations in OR I:108, which is now used as reference point; and (b) W's scribe apparently decided to switch the order of OR I:120, placing it here and omitting it where the other MSS incorporate it. The scribe of W logically attempted to resolve the problem of how those standing in line will receive Communion from the pope if he has already returned to his seat. This is unnecessary, of course, since the rest of OR I:118 provides another justification for their presence near the pope. It is possible that W's scribe took this passage only to refer to the members of the *schola*. In addition, the second sentence W includes here is awkward, since it switches to the reception of the wine, and then the next sentence refers to the reception of the bread again. It is much more natural in OR I:120, where it no doubt appeared in the original.
25. OR I:118 (p. 106, lns. 4–8): The passage *et ... communicent* was part of the original document. It is included in Y and W, and it was only omitted by the beta group.
26. OR I:119–22 (pp. 106–7, lns. 8–18 on p. 106 and lns. 1–5 on p. 107): These four chapters of OR I were eliminated by the beta family of MSS, but they were almost certainly in the original version. They allow us to see how a significant portion of the papal ministers received Communion, and further describe the full process by which the *Gloria patri* was chanted. One final adjustment, however, should be made to Andrieu's edition: In OR I:121, *Ille* should be read for *I le*, a typographical error.

All editing is conjectural, and it is impossible to reconstruct a text as difficult as OR I in every detail. There is always the chance that a new MS of OR I will be discovered and it will force us to reconsider previous readings. However, I do think that removing the interpolations and variants I have discussed in this chapter helps us to represent more accurately the original version of OR I as it was used in Rome.

Appendix 2

A New Presentation and Translation of the First Roman Ordo

[Ordo Romanus Primus (OR I)]

Incipit ordo ecclesiastici ministerii
romanae ecclesiae vel qualiter missa
celebratur.

1. Primum omnium observandum est
septem esse regiones ecclesiastici ordinis
urbis Romae et unaquaeque regio
singulos habere diacones regionarios.
2. Et uniuscuiusque regionis acolyti
per manum subdiaconi regionarii
diacono regionis suae officii causa
subduntur.
3. Quorum diaconorum si quando
quispiam moritur, donec loco eius
alius subrogetur, illius regionis acolyti
archidiacono oboediunt, quia omnes
acolyti, cuiuscumque regionis sunt, causa
ecclesiastici officii ad ministerium eius
pertinent.
4. Quod etiam de sequentibus
ordinibus intelligendum est, servata
uniquique post eum proprii gradus
archidiaconi in sui ordinis ministerio
subditis, ut si quis, verbi gratia, vim
passus fuerit sive ab ecclesiastico
seu a quacumque militari persona,
si a sui ordinis primo eius causa ad
effectum minime pervenerit, habeat
archidiaconus, id est vicarius pontificis,

[The First Roman Ordo (OR I)]

Here begins the order of ecclesiastical
ministry of the Roman Church or how
Mass is celebrated.

1. First of all it must be observed that there
are seven regions of the ecclesiastical order
of the city of Rome and each region has its
own regionary deacons.
2. And the acolytes of each region are
subordinated by authority of the regionary
subdeacon to the deacon of their region by
reason of his office.
3. When any of the deacons dies,
the acolytes of his region obey the
archdeacon until another is chosen
in his place, because all acolytes of
whatever region they are belong to his
ministry by reason of their ecclesiastical
office.
4. This furthermore must be understood
about the following orders: the rank of
archdeacon in particular, preserving [the
rights] of each one under him, subordinate
to the ministry of his order, so that if
someone, for instance, suffers violence at
the hand of either a cleric or any military
person, if his case does not come before the
head of his own order, let the archdeacon,
that is, the representative of the pope,

causam, qualiter subditorum sibi quaerelas absque notitia possit explicare pontificis; caetera vero per minores ordines finiuntur.

5. Nam primo scire oportet, ut, post numerum ecclesiasticarum regionum, sciat, qui voluerit, numerum dierum per ebdomadem, quo ordine circulariter obsequantur: nam prima feria regio tertia, id est paschae, secunda feria regio quarta, tertia feria regio quinta, feria quarta regio sexta, feria quinta regio septima, feria sexta regio prima, sabbato regio secunda ordines proprios tam in processione quam in ecclesia, vel ubicumque eos propria dies ratione sui gradus prisca statutio ire vel ministrare compulerit, a ministerio pontificis non poterit sine ulla sui deesse excommunicationis vel animadversionis sententia disciplinae.

6. Quorum ministeria primitus secundum rationem simplicem dupliciter diebus singulis dividuntur, id est in processione apostolici ad stationem et in egressu sacrarii usque ad missarum consummationem.

7. Diebus itaque sollempnibus, id est pascha, primo omnes acolyti regionis tertiae et defensores omnium regionum convenientes diluculo in patriarchio Lateranensi procedunt pontificem pedestres ad stationem.

8. Stratores autem laici a dextris et a sinistris equi ambulant ne alicubi titubet.

9. Qui autem eum equitantes praecedunt, hii sunt: diacones,

manage the case: so that he can settle the complaints of his subordinates without the pope's knowledge. But let other matters be settled by the minor orders.

5. Now first it is necessary to know that, after the number of the ecclesiastical regions, anyone who wishes to may know the sequence of days in the week in the order in which they are cyclically observed: on Sunday, that is Easter, the third region; on Monday, the fourth region; on Tuesday, the fifth region; on Wednesday, the sixth region; on Thursday, the seventh region; on Friday, the first region; on Saturday, the second region. It is not possible to be absent from the pope's service, whether from the procession or from the Church or wherever else ancient statute requires the different orders to go and serve on a particular day in accordance with their rank, without some disciplinary sentence of excommunication or censure.

6. First of all, their duties are divided every day into two parts according to a simple plan: that is, in the procession of the *apostolicus* to the stational church and from the departure from the sacristy to the completion of the Mass.

7. Accordingly, therefore, on solemn days, that is Easter, first all the acolytes of the third region and *defensores* of all regions, meeting at daybreak in the palace of the Lateran, proceed on foot before the pope to the stational church.

8. The lay grooms walk to the right and the left of the horse so that it does not stumble anywhere.

9. Those who precede him on horseback are: the deacons, the *primicerius* [of the notaries]

primicerius et duo notarii regionarii, defensores regionarii, subdiaconi regionarii. Procedunt vero divisim turmis, spatium inter se et apostolicum facientes.

and the two regionary notaries, the regionary *defensores*, the regionary subdeacons. They advance in two troops, making a space between themselves and the *apostolicus*.

10. Post equum vero hi sunt qui equitant: vicedominus, vesterarius, nomincolator atque sacellarius.

10. These ride after the [pope's] horse: the *vicedominus*, the *vesterarius*, the *nomincolator*, and the *sacellarius*.

11. Unus autem ex acolytis stationariis praecedit pedester equum pontificis gestans sanctum chrisma manu in mappula involuta cum ampulla. Sed et omnes acolyti absque sacculis et syndones et chrismate non procedunt, quod disponit stationarius.

11. One of the stational acolytes, however, precedes the pope's horse on foot, carrying in his hand the holy chrism in a flask wrapped in a maniple. But all the acolytes without sacks and linen cloths and chrism do not process, which the stational [acolyte] regulates.

12. Si quis autem adire voluerit pontificem, si equitat, statim ut eum viderit, discendit de equo et ex latere viae expectat, usquedum ab eo possit audiri.

12. If anyone riding on horseback wishes to approach the pope, he dismounts as soon as he sees him, and waits at the side of the road until he can be heard by him.

13. Et, petita ab eo benedictione, discutitur a nomincolatore vel sacellario causa eius et ipsi indicant pontifici et finiunt; quod etiam observabitur etiamsi absque ulla petitione ei quisquam obuius fuerit.

13. And, after requesting a blessing, his case is examined by the *nomincolator* or the *sacellarius* and they make it known to the pope and settle [it]; this procedure will also be observed even if someone without any petition meets him on the way.

14. Qui vero pedester fuerit, tantummodo loco suo figitur, ut ab eo audiatur vel benedicatur.

14. But anyone on foot remains in his place, so that he may be heard or blessed by him.

15. Die autem resurrectionis dominicae, procedente eo ad Sanctam Mariam, notarius regionarius stat in loco qui dicitur Merolanas et, salutato pontifice, dicit:

15. On the day of the Lord's resurrection, however, having gone ahead of him to Santa Maria [Maggiore], the regionary notary stands in the place called Merulana and, greeting the pope, says:

In nomine domini nostri Iesu Christi, baptizati sunt hesternae nocte in sancta Dei genetrice Maria infantes masculi numero tanti, feminae tantae.

In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, last night in [the church of] Santa Maria the Mother of God so many baby boys and so many baby girls were baptized.

Respondit pontifex; *Deo gratias*.

The pope responds: *Thanks be to God*.

Et accepit a sacellario solido uno;
pontifex autem pergit ad stationem.

And he receives one solidus from the
sacellarius; but the pope goes on to the
stational church.

16. Feria secunda, ad remissa similiter.

16. On Monday, at the *remissa* in similar
fashion.

17. Feria tertia, in reflexione portici
sancti Pauli tantum item qui pedestres
absequuntur.

17. On Tuesday, at the bend of the portico
of San Paolo [fuori le Mura], only those
who are on foot observe [it].

18. In diem vero sanctum paschae, omnes
acolyti regionis tertiae simul et defensores
omnium regionum conveniunt primo
diluculo in patriarchio Lateranensi, ut,
dum processerit pontifex, equum illius
praecedant.

18. On the holy day of Easter, all the
acolytes of the third region, together with
the *defensores* of all the regions, meet at
first light in the Lateran palace, so that,
when the pope comes forth, they may go
ahead of his horse.

19. Acolyti autem, qui inde fuerint,
observant ut portent chrisma ante
pontificem et evangelia, sindones et
sacculos et aquamanus post eum, sicut
supra diximus.

19. The acolytes who are from there take
care that they carry the chrism in front of
the pope and the evangeliary, linen cloths,
sacks, and hand basin behind him, as we
said above.

20. Apostolum autem subdiaconus
qui lecturus est sub cura sua habebit,
evangelium archidiaconus.

20. The subdeacon who is to read will
have the epistolary under his care, the
archdeacon the evangeliary.

21. Aquamanus, patena cottidiana,
calicem, sciffos et pugillares et alios
aureos et gemelliones argenteos,
colatorio argenteo et aureo et alio
maiore argenteo, amas argenteas,
cantatorio et caetera vasa aurea et
argentea, cereostata aurea et argentea
de ecclesia Salvatoris per manum
primi mansionarii sumunt et baiuli
portant.

21. They receive from the Church of the
Savior the hand basin, the daily paten,
the chalice, the *sciffi* and liturgical straws
and other small gold and silver cruets,
with a silver and gold strainer and another
larger silver one, silver flagons, with the
cantatorium and the other gold and silver
vessels, gold and silver candlesticks from
the hand of the first of the sextons and the
porters carry [them].

22. Diebus vero festis, calicem et
patenam maiores et evangelia maiora
de vestiario dominico exeunt sub sigillo

22. But on feast days, the larger chalice and
the paten and the larger evangeliary go out
from the lord's wardrobe under the seal of

vesterarii per numerum gemmarum, ut non perdantur.

the *vesterarius* on account of the number of the gems, so that they are not lost.

23. Sellam pontificis cubicularius laicus praecedens deportat, ut parata sit dum in sacrario venerit.

23. The lay chamberlain, going ahead, carries the pope's Chair, so that it is ready when he comes into the sacristy.

24. Denuntiata statione diebus festis, primo mane praecedit omnis clerus apostolicum ad ecclesiam, exceptis his qui in obsequio illius comitantur ut supra diximus, et expectantes pontificem in ecclesia cum supplementario et baiulis et reliquis qui cruces portant, sedentes in presbiterio, episcopi quidem ad sinistram intransibibus, presbyteri vero in dexteram, ut, quando pontifex sederit, ad eos respiciens, episcopos ad dexteram sui, presbiteros vero ad sinistram contineatur.

24. When the station is announced on feast days, all the clergy go ahead of the *apostolicus* to the church early in the morning, except those in his service, who accompany him, as we said above; and waiting for the pope in the church with the *supplementarius* and the porters and the rest who carry crosses, the bishops sitting in the presbytery are on the left of those entering, but the priests [are] on the right, so that when the pope sits, looking at them, he may see the bishops on his right, but the priests on his left.

25. Sed dum venerit pontifex prope ecclesiam, exeuntes acolyti et defensores ex regione illa cuius dies ad officium fuerit in obsequio praestolantur cum in loco statuto, antequam veniat ubi discensurus est.

25. But when the pope approaches the church, the acolytes and *defensores* from that region whose day it is for the office of service, going outside, stand ready for him in the appointed place, before he comes to the place where he will dismount.

26. Similiter et presbiter tituli vel ecclesiae ubi statio fuerit, una cum maioribus domus ecclesiae romanae, vel pater diaconiae, si tamen illa ecclesia diaconiae fuerit, cum subdito sibi presbitero et mansionario tymiamaterium deferentibus in obsequium illius inclinato capite dum venerit.

26. In similar fashion, too, the priest of the *titulus* or church where the station is, together with the mayors of the palace of the Roman Church, or the father of the *diaconia*, if it is the church of a *diaconia*, with the priest subordinate to him and the sexton carrying a thurible in his service, bow their heads in allegiance to him when he comes.

27. Acolytus quidem cum defensoribus primum, deinde presbiter cum suis, petita benedictione, divisus hinc inde partibus, prout militant, praecedunt pontificem usque ad ecclesiam.

27. First the acolyte, along with the *defensores*, then the priest with his men, having requested a blessing, divide on either side into groups as they perform their service [and] go ahead of the pope into the church.

28. *Advocatores autem ecclesiae stant quidem cum maioribus, non autem praecedunt cum eis, sed ipsi tantummodo sequuntur sellarem pontificis cum acolyto qui aquammanus portat, quem semper necesse est sequi pontificem, usquedum ad altare ascendit, paratus sub humero in presbyterio, quando vocetur a subdiacono regionario ad aquam dandam.*

29. *Cum vero ecclesiam introierit pontifex, non ascendit continuo ad altare sed prius intrat in secretario, sustentatus a diaconibus, qui eum susceperint de sellario descendentem, ubi, dum intraverit, sedet in sella sua et diaconi, salutato pontifice, egrediuntur secretario et ante fores eiusdem mutant vestimenta sua.*

30. *Et parat evangelium qui lecturus est; reserato sigillo, ex praecepto archidiaconi, super planetam acolyti, et si necesse fuerit propter maiora evangelia duobus acolytis super planetam tenentibus, parat evangelium.*

31. *Quo facto, acolytus defert evangelium usque ante altare in presbyterio, precedente eum subdiacono sequente, qui, eum de super planeta illius suscipiens, manibus suis honorifice super altare ponat.*

32. *Nam, egredientibus diaconibus de secretario, remanent cum pontifice primicerius, secundicerius, primicerius defensorum, notarii regionarii, defensores regionarii, subdiaconi et subdiaconus sequens, qui tenet pallium pontificis in brachio suo super planeta in sinistro brachio cum acus.*

28. The advocates of the church, moreover, stand with the mayors of the palace, yet they do not go forward with them, but only follow the pope's Chair with the acolyte who carries the hand basin, who must always follow the pope, until he ascends to the altar, ready at his shoulder in the presbytery, to give the water when he is called by the regionary subdeacon.

29. When the pope enters the church, he does not ascend immediately to the altar, but first enters the *secretarium*, supported by the deacons who receive him when he dismounts from the saddle, where, when he enters, he sits in his Chair and the deacons, after having greeted the pope, leave the *secretarium* and change their vestments in front of its doors.

30. And he who is to read prepares the evangelary: after opening the seal at the archdeacon's command, over the acolyte's chasuble, and if it is necessary for a larger evangelary, with two acolytes holding it over the chasuble, he prepares the evangelary.

31. After this is done, the acolyte carries the evangelary in front of the altar in the presbytery, with the attendant subdeacon going ahead of him, who, receiving it over his chasuble, places [it] honorably on the altar with his hands.

32. Now when the deacons leave the *secretarium*, there remain with the pope the *primicerius* [of the notaries], the *secundicerius* [of the notaries], the *primicerius* of the *defensores*, the regionary notaries, the regionary *defensores*, the subdeacons, and the attendant subdeacon, who has the pope's pallium on his arm over his chasuble on his left arm with a pin.

33. Pontifex autem per manus subdiaconorum regionariorum mutat vestimenta sollemnia hoc ordine: deferat ea plicata cubicularius tonsoratus, accepta a manibus ostiarii, iuxta caput scamni, subdiacono regionario.

34. Et tunc ceteri subdiaconi regionarii secundum ordinem suum accipiunt ad induendum pontificem ipsa vestimenta, alius lineam, alius cingulum, alius anagolaium, id est amictum, alius lineam dalmaticam et alius maiorem dalmaticam et alius planetam et sic per ordinem induunt pontificem.

35. Primicerius autem et secundicerius componunt vestimenta eius, ut bene seadeant.

36. Novissime autem quem voluerit dominus pontifex de diaconibus vel subdiaconibus, cui ipse iusserit, sumit de manu subdiaconi sequentis pallium et induit super pontificem et configit eum cum acus in planeta retro et ante et in humero sinistro et salutatur domno, dicit: *Iube, domne, benedicere*. Respondet: *Salvet nos dominus. Amen*.

37. Deinde subdiaconus regionarius, tenens mappulam pontificis in sinistro brachio super planetam revolutam, exiens ad regiam secretarii, dicit: *Scola*. Respondet: *Adsum*. Et ille: *Quis psallit?* Respondet: *Ille et Ille*.

38. Et rediens ad pontificem subdiaconus porrigit ei mappulam, inclinans se ad genua ipsius, dicens: *Servi domini mei talis subdiaconus regionarius legit apostolum et talis de scola cantat*.

33. The pope, however, with the assistance of the the regionary subdeacons changes the solemn vestments in this order: the tonsured chamberlain carries them folded, after receiving them from the hands of the ostiary, near the end of the bench, to the regionary subdeacon.

34. And then the other regionary subdeacons according to their order receive the vestments to vest the pope, one the alb, another a belt, and another the *anagolaium*, that is the amice, another the linen dalmatic, and another the large dalmatic, and another the chasuble and thus in order they vest the pope.

35. The *primicerius* and the *secundicerius* [of the notaries] arrange his vestments, so that they hang well.

36. Finally, whichever deacon or subdeacon the lord pope wishes and designates, takes the pallium from the hand of the attendant subdeacon and he places it on the pope and fastens it with a pin on the back and front of the chasuble and on his left shoulder and greets the lord [pope], he says: *Deign, O lord, to give the blessing*. He responds: *May the Lord save us. Amen*.

37. Then the regionary subdeacon, holding the pope's maniple rolled up in his left hand over the chasuble, going out to the portico of the *secretarium*, says: *Schola*. He responds: *I am here*. And he: *Who is chanting?* He responds: *He and he*.

38. And returning to the pope the subdeacon offers the maniple to him, bowing to his knees, saying: *The servants of my lord the distinguished regionary subdeacon is reading the epistle and the distinguished [subdeacon] from the schola is chanting*.

39. Et iam non licet alterum mutare in loco lectoris vel cantoris. Quod si factum fuerit, archiparafonista a pontifice excommunicabitur, id est quartus scolae, qui semper pontifici nuntiat de cantoribus.

40. Qui dum nuntiatum fuerit, statim sequitur quartus scolae subdiaconus, adstans ante faciem pontificis, usquedum ei annuat pontifex ut psallant; cui dum annuerit, statim egreditur ante fores secretarii et dicit: *Accendite*.

41. Qui dum incenderint, statim subdiaconus sequens, tenens tymiamaterium aureum, pro foribus ponit incensum, ut pergat ante pontificem.

42. Et ille quartus scolae pervenit in presbyterio ad priorem scolae, vel secundum sive tertium, inclinato capite, dicit: *Domne, iubete*.

43. Tunc illi, elevantes per ordinem, vadunt ante altare; statuuntur per ordinem acies duae tantum iuxta ordinem, parafonistae quidem hinc inde a foris, infantes ab utroque latere infra per ordinem.

44. Et mox incipit prior scolae antiphonam ad introitum, quorum vocem diaconi dum audierint, continuo intrant ad pontificem in secretarium.

45. Et tunc pontifex elevans se dat manum dexteram archidiacono et sinistram secundo, vel qui fuerit in ordine; et illi, osculatis manibus ipsius, procedunt cum ipso sustentantes eum.

39. And at this point it is not allowed to substitute another in the position of lector or cantor. If this were to be done, the *archiparafonista*, that is the fourth one of the *schola*, who always announces the cantors to the pope, will be excommunicated by the pope.

40. When this is announced, immediately the fourth one of the *schola*, a subdeacon, follows, standing before the pope, until the pope signals to him that they may chant; when he nods his assent to him, he goes out immediately before the doors of the *secretarium* and says: *Light [the incense]*.

41. When they have lit [the incense], immediately the attendant subdeacon, holding the golden thurible, places the incense outside the doors, so that he may go before the pope.

42. And the fourth of the *schola* comes into the presbytery to the prior of the *schola*, or the second or the third, after bowing his head, says: *O Lord, [give the] command*.

43. Then they, rising in order, go in front of the altar; they stand in order – two lines only according to rank, the *parafonistae* on either side on the outside, the children in order on both sides on the inside.

44. And at once the prior of the *schola* begins the introit; upon hearing their voices the deacons immediately go in to the pope in the *secretarium*.

45. And then the pope, rising, gives his right hand to the archdeacon and his left to the second [deacon], or who is next in order; and they, kissing his hands, advance supporting him.

46. Tunc subdiaconus sequens cum tymiamaterio praecedit ante ipsum, mittens incensum, et septem acolyti illius regionis cuius dies fuerit, portantes septem cereostata accensa praecedunt ante pontificem usque ante altare.

47. Sed, priusquam veniant ante altare, diacones in presbyterio exuuntur planetis et suscipit eas subdiaconus regionarius et porrigit illas ad acolytos regionis cuius fuerint diaconi.

48. Et tunc duo acolyti, tenentes capsas cum Sancta apertas, et subdiaconus sequens cum ipsis tenens manum suam in ore capsae ostendit Sancta pontifici vel diacono qui processerit. Tunc, inclinatio capite, pontifex vel diaconus salutatur Sancta et contemplatur ut, si fuerit superabundans, praecipiat ut ponatur in conditorio.

49. Tunc peraccedens, antequam veniat ad scolam, dividuntur cereostata, quattuor ad dexteram et tres ad sinistram et pertransit pontifex in caput scholae et inclinat caput ad altare, surgens et orans et faciens crucem in fronte sua, et dat pacem uni episcopo de ebdomadariis et archipresbitero et diaconibus omnibus.

50. Et respiciens ad priorem scholae annuit ei ut dicat *Gloriam*; et prior scholae inclinat se pontifici et inponit. Quartus vero scholae praecedit ante pontificem, ut ponat oratorium ante altare; et accedens pontifex orat super ipsum usque ad repetitionem versus.

46. Then the attendant subdeacon with the thurible goes ahead of him, sending forth incense, and the seven acolytes of the region whose day it is, carrying seven lit candlesticks go up before the pope to the front of the altar.

47. But, before they come to the front of the altar, the deacons in the presbytery remove their chasubles and the regionary subdeacon receives them and offers them to the acolytes of the region to which the deacon belongs.

48. And then two acolytes, holding open the pyxes with the Sacred Element, and the attendant subdeacon with them holding his hand in the opening of the pyx shows the Sacred Element to the pope or to the deacon who walks in procession. Then, after bowing his head, the pope or the deacon greets the Sacred Element and examines [it] so that if there is too much, he may command that it be put in the repository.

49. Then passing on, before reaching the *schola*, the candlesticks are divided, four to the right and three to the left, and the pope crosses to the top part of the *schola* and bows his head to the altar, standing up and praying and making the sign of the cross on his forehead, and gives the peace to one of the weekly bishops and to the archpriest and to all the deacons.

50. And looking at the prior of the *schola* he signals to him that he should chant the *Gloria* [*patri*]; and the prior of the *schola* bows to the pope and intones. The fourth of the *schola* goes ahead of the pope, so that he places the rug in front of the altar; and approaching, the pope prays on it until the repetition of the verse.

51. Nam diaconi surgunt quando dicit: *Sicut erat*, ut saluent altaris latera, prius duo et duo vicissim redeunt ad pontificem. Et surgens pontifex osculat evangelia et altare et accedit ad sedem et stat versus ad orientem.

52. Scola vero, finita antiphona, inponit *Kyrielesion*. Prior vero scholae custodit ad pontificem, ut ei annuat quando vult mutare numerum laetaniae et inclinat se pontifici.

53. Quam dum finierint, incipit pontifex *Gloria in excelsis Deo*, si tempus fuerit, et non sedit antequam dicant, post orationem primam, *Amen*.

55. Et tunc ascendunt subdiaconi regionarii ad altare, statuantes se ad dexteram sive sinistram altaris.

56. Subdiaconus vero qui lecturus est, mox ut viderit post pontificem episcopos vel presbiteros resedentes, ascendit in ambonem et legit.

57. Postquam legerit, cantor cum cantatorio ascendit et dicit responsum. Si fuerit tempus ut dicat *Alleluia*, bene; sin autem, tractum; sin minus, tantummodo responsum.

59. Deinde diaconus osculans pedes pontificis et tacite dicit ei pontifex: *Dominus sit in corde tuo et in labiis tuis*. Deinde venit ante altare et, osculatis evangeliiis, levat in manus suas codicem et procedunt ante ipsum duo subdiaconi regionarii levantes tymiamaterium de manu subdiaconi sequentis, mittentes incensum, et ante se habentes duos acolytos portantes

51. The deacons now stand up when he chants: *As it was*, so that they may greet the sides of the altar, first two, then two by two, returning to the pope. And rising, the pope kisses the evangeliary and the altar and goes to his Chair and stands facing the East.

52. Now the *schola*, having finished the antiphon, intones the *Kyrie eleison*. Now the prior of the *schola* watches the pope, so that he may signal to him when he wishes to change the number of invocations and bows to the pope.

53. When they finish, the pope begins the *Gloria in excelsis Deo*, if it is the season, and he does not sit before they say *Amen* after the first prayer.

55. And then the regionary subdeacons go up to the altar, stationing themselves at the right and the left of the altar.

56. As soon as he sees the bishops and priests sitting down again after the pope, the subdeacon who is to read goes up to the ambo and reads.

57. After he has read, a cantor with the *cantatorium* goes up and chants the response. If it is the season in which he may chant the *Alleluia*, good; but if not, the tract; but if not that, only the response.

59. Then the deacon kisses the pope's feet, and the pope says quietly to him: *May the Lord be in your heart and on your lips*. Then he comes in front of the altar and having kissed the evangeliary, raises the book in his hands, and two regionary subdeacons advance in front of him, taking the thurible from the attendant subdeacon's hand, sending out incense, and before him having two acolytes

duo cereostata; venientes ad ambonem dividuntur ipsi acolyti ante ambonem et transeunt subdiaconi et diaconus cum evangelia per medium eorum.

61. Ille qui absque timiamaterio est, vertens se ad diaconem porrigit ei brachium suum sinistrum, in quo ponit evangelium, ut manu subdiaconi aperiat eum locus in quo signum lectionis positum fuerit.

62. Et, interposito digito suo, diaconus in loco lectionis ascendit ad legendum et illi duo subdiaconi redeunt stare ante gradum discensionis ambonis.

63. Finito evangelio, dicit pontifex: *Pax tibi. Dominus vobiscum. Et cum spiritu tuo.*

64. Descendente autem diacono, subdiaconus qui prius aperuerat, recipit evangelium et porrigit eum subdiacono sequenti, qui in filo stat; quod tenens ante pectus suum super planetam porrigit osculandum omnibus per ordinem graduum qui steterint,

65. et post hoc praeeparato acolyto in poio iuxta ambonem cum capsula in qua subdiaconus idem ponit evangelium ut sigilletur. Acolytus autem regionis eiusdem cuius et subdiaconus est revocat evangelium ad Lateranum.

67. Deinde, pergente diacono ad altare, stante acolyto cum calice et corporale super eum, levat calicem in brachio sinistro et porrigit diacono corporalem, ut accipiat de super calicem, et ponit eum super altare a dextris, proiecto

carrying two candlesticks; coming to the ambo the acolytes separate in front of the ambo and the subdeacons and deacon pass between them with the evangelary.

61. The one who is without a thurible, turning to the deacon, extends his left arm to him, on which he places the evangelary, so that the place in which the mark for reading was placed may be opened by the hand of the subdeacon.

62. And, having inserted his finger, the deacon goes up to the reading position to read and the two subdeacons return to stand in front of the step descending from the ambo.

63. After the Gospel is finished, the pope says: *Peace be with you. The Lord be with you. And with your spirit.*

64. After the deacon descends, the subdeacon who previously opened receives the evangelary and offers it to the attendant subdeacon, who stands in line; holding [it] in front of his chest over the chasuble, [he] presents it to be kissed by all in the order of the ranks in which they stand;

65. and after this, the acolyte, prepared at the enclosure next to the ambo with the case in which the same subdeacon places the evangelary so that it may be sealed. The acolyte of the same region whose [day it is] and the subdeacon return the evangelary to the Lateran.

67. Then, the deacon, proceeding to the altar as the acolyte stands with the chalice and the corporal over it, raises the chalice in his left hand and offers the corporal to the deacon, so that he may take it from over the chalice, and places it on the altar at the

capite altero ad diaconem secundum ut expandant.

right, extending the other end to the second deacon so that they may spread [it] out.

68. Tunc ascendunt ad sedem primicerius et secundicerius et primicerius defensorum, cum omnibus regionariis et notariis; subdiaconus vero cum calice vacuo sequitur archidiacono.

68. Then the *primicerius* and the *secundicerius* [of the notaries] and the *primicerius* of the *defensores*, with all the regionaries and notaries ascend to the Chair; but the subdeacon with the empty chalice follows the archdeacon.

69. Pontifex autem descendit ad senatorium, tenente manum eius dexteram primicerio notariorum et primicerio defensorum sinistram, et suscipit oblationes principum per ordinem archium.

69. The pope, however, descends to the *senatorium*, with the *primicerius* of the notaries holding his right hand and the *primicerius* of the *defensores* his left [hand], and he receives the [lay] offerings of the leading men in the order of their dignities.

70. Archidiaconus post eum suscipit amulas et refundit in calice maiore, tenente eum subdiacono regionario, quem sequitur cum sciffo super planetam acolytus, in quo calix impletus refunditur.

70. The archdeacon behind him receives the smaller flagons and pours them into the large chalice, held by the regionary subdeacon, whom the acolyte follows with the *sciffus* over his chasuble, into which the full chalice is poured.

71. Oblationes a pontifice suscipit subdiaconus regionarius et porrigit subdiacono sequenti et subdiaconus sequens ponit in sindone quam tenent duo acolyti.

71. The regionary subdeacon receives the [lay] offerings from the pope and offers [them] to the attendant subdeacon and the attendant subdeacon places [them] on the linen cloth held by the two acolytes.

72. Reliquas oblationes post pontificem suscipit episcopus ebdomadarius, ut ipse manu sua mittat eas in sindone qui eum sequitur.

72. The weekly bishop receives the remaining [lay] offerings after the pope, so that he may by his hand place them on the linen cloth that follows him.

73. Post quem diaconus, qui sequitur post archidiaconem, suscipit [calicem] et manu sua refundit in sciffum.

73. After which the deacon, who follows behind the archdeacon, receives [the chalice] and with his hand pours it into the *sciffus*.

74. Pontifex vero, antequam transeat in partem mulierum, descendit ante confessionem et suscipit oblatas primicerii et secundicerii et primicerii

74. The pope, before crossing into the women's section, descends in front of the *confessio* and receives the [clerical] offerings of the *primicerius* and *secundicerius* [of the notaries] and the *primicerius* of the

defensorum; nam in diebus festis post
diacones ad altare offerunt.

75. Similiter ascendens pontifex in parte
feminarum ordine quo supra omnia
explet.

76. Tunc, tenentibus primicerio et
secundicerio manus eius, redit in
sedem.

77. Archidiaconus stans ante altare,
expleta susceptione, lavat manus suas;
deinde respicit in faciem pontificis,
annuit ei et ille resalutato accedit ad
altare.

78. Tunc subdiaconi regionarii,
levantes oblatas de manu subdiaconi
sequentis super brachia sua, porrigunt
archidiacono et ille componit altare;
nam subdiaconi hinc inde porrigunt.

79. Ornato vero altare, tunc
archidiaconus sumit amulam pontificis
de subdiacono oblationario et refundit
super colum in calicem, deinde
diaconorum et in die festo primicerii,
secundicerii, primicerii defensorum.

80. Deinde descendit subdiaconus
sequens in scola, accipit fontem de manu
archiparafonistae et defert archidiacono
et ille infundit, faciens crucem, in
calicem.

81. Tunc ascendunt diaconi ad
pontificem; quos videntes primicerius,

defensores; for on feast days they make
offerings at the altar after the deacons.

75. In similar fashion the pope, going
up into the women's section, completes
everything in the same order as above.

76. Then, with the *primicerius* and
secundicerius [of the notaries] holding his
hand, he returns to the Chair.

77. The reception completed, the
archdeacon standing in front of the altar
washes his hands; then he looks towards
the pope's face, nods to him and [the
pope], having returned the salutation,
goes to the altar.

78. Then the regionary subdeacons, raising
the [clerical] offerings from the attendant
subdeacon's hand on their forearms,
present [them] to the archdeacon and he
arranges the altar; now the subdeacons
present [them] from either side.

79. When the altar has been prepared, the
archdeacon then takes the pope's smaller
flagon from the *oblationarius* subdeacon
and pours it through the strainer into the
chalice, then the deacons' [smaller flagon]
and on a feast day [the smaller flagons] of
the *primicerius* and the *secundicerius* [of
the notaries], and the *primicerius* of the
defensores.

80. Then the attendant subdeacon descends
to the *schola*, receives the ewer from the
hand of the *archiparafonista* and carries [it]
to the archdeacon and he pours [it] into the
chalice, making the sign of the cross.

81. Then the deacons go up to the
pope: seeing them, the *primicerius* and
secundicerius [of the notaries], and the

secundicerius et primicerius defensorum regionariorum et notarii regionarii et defensores regionarii descendunt de aciebus, ut stent in loco suo.

primicerius of the regionary *defensores*, and the regionary notaries and the regionary *defensores* descend from the lines, so that they may stand in their place.

82. Tunc surgit pontifex a sede, descendit ad altare et salutat altare et suscipit oblatas de manu presbiteri ebdomadarii et diaconorum.

82. Then the pope rises from his Chair, descends to the altar and greets the altar and receives the [clerical] offerings from the hand of the weekly priest and the deacons.

83. Deinde archidiaconus suscipit oblatas pontificis de oblationario et dat pontifici.

83. Then the archdeacon receives the [clerical] offerings of the pope from the *oblationarius* [subdeacon] and gives [them] to the pope.

84. Quas dum posuerit pontifex in altare, levat archidiaconus calicem de manu subdiaconi regionarii et ponit eum super altare iuxta oblatam pontificis ad dextris, involutis ansis cum offerturio, quem ponit in cornu altaris, et stat post pontificem.

84. When the pope places them on the altar, the archdeacon takes the chalice from the hand of the regionary subdeacon and places it on the altar next to the pope's [clerical] offering to the right, having covered the handles with the offertory veil, which he places at the corner of the altar, and stands behind the pope.

85. Et pontifex, inclinans se paululum ad altare, respicit scolam et annuit ut silent.

85. And the pope, bowing slightly to the altar, looks to the *schola* and signals that they be silent.

86. Tunc, finito offertorio, episcopi sunt stantes post pontificem, primus in medio, deinde per ordinem, et archidiaconus a dextris episcoporum, secundus diaconus a sinistris et ceteri per ordinem disposita acie.

86. Then, having finished the offertory, the bishops are standing behind the pope, the first [bishop] in the middle, then in order, and the archdeacon to the bishops' right, the second deacon to the left, and the others in order arranged in a line.

87. Et subdiaconi regionarii, finito offertorio, vadunt retro altare, aspicientes ad pontificem, stantes erecti usquedum incipiant dicere hymnum angelicum, id est *Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus*.

87. And the regionary subdeacons, after the offertory is finished, go behind the altar, looking at the pope, standing upright until they begin to chant the angelic hymn, that is the *Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus*.

88. Quem dum expleverint, surgit pontifex solus et intrat in canonem; episcopi

88. When they have finished it, the pope alone rises and begins the Canon; but the

vero, diaconi, subdiaconi et presbyteri in presbyterio permanent inclinati.

bishops, deacons, subdeacons, and priests in the presbytery remain bowed.

89. Et dum dixerit: *Nobis quoque peccatoribus*, surgunt subdiaconi; cum dixerit: *Per quem haec omnia, domine*, surgit archidiaconus solus; cum dixerit: *Per ipsum et cum ipso*, levat cum offertorio calicem per ansas et tenet exaltans illum iuxta pontificem.

89. And when he says: *To us sinners also*, the subdeacons rise; when he says: *Through Whom all these things, O Lord*, the archdeacon alone rises; when he says: *Through Him and with Him*, he raises the chalice with the offertory veil around the handles and holds it, elevated, beside the pope.

90. Pontifex autem tangit a latere calicem cum oblatis, dicens: *Per ipsum et cum ipso*, usque: *Per omnia saecula saeculorum*, et ponit oblationes in loco suo et archidiaconus calicem iuxta eas, dimisso offerturio in ansas eiusdem.

90. The pope touches the side of the chalice with the [clerical] offerings, saying: *Through Him and with Him*, until: *For ever and ever*, and places the [lay] offerings in their place and the archdeacon [places] the chalice next to them, having removed the offertory veil from its handles.

91. Nam quod intermisimus de patena, quando inchoat canonem, venit acolytus sub humero habens sindonem in collo ligatum, tenens patenam ante pectus suum in parte dextera usque medium canonem.

91. Now what we omitted about the paten: When [the pope] begins the Canon, the acolyte, with the linen cloth tied around his neck, comes to the pope's side, holding the paten in front of his chest on the right side until the middle of the Canon.

92. Tunc subdiaconus sequens suscipit eam super planetam et venit ante altare, expectans quando eam suscipiat subdiaconus regionarius.

92. Then the attendant subdeacon receives it over [his] chasuble and comes before the altar, waiting until the regionary subdeacon can receive it.

93. Finito vero canone, subdiaconus regionarius stat cum patena post archidiaconem.

93. When the Canon is finished, the regionary subdeacon stands behind the archdeacon with the paten.

94. Quando dixerit: *et ab omni perturbatione securi*, vertit se archidiaconus et osculatam patenam dat eam tenendam diacono secundo.

94. When he says: *and safe from all distress*, the archdeacon turns around and, having kissed the paten, gives it to the second deacon to hold.

95. Cum dixerit: *Pax domini sit semper vobiscum*, mittit in calicem de Sancta.

95. When he says: *May the peace of the Lord be with you always*, he drops a piece of the Sacred Element into the chalice.

96. Sed archidiaconus pacem dat episcopo priori, deinde caeteri per ordinem et populus.

96. Now the archdeacon gives the peace to the senior bishop, then to the others in order and to the people.

97. Tunc pontifex rumpit oblatam ex latere dextro et particulam quam ruperit partem super altare relinquit; reliquas vero oblationes suas ponit in patenam quam tenet diaconus.

97. Then the pope breaks the [clerical] offering on the right side and leaves the particle that he has broken off on the altar; but now he places his remaining [lay] offerings on the paten held by the deacon.

98. Et redit ad sedem. Mox primicerius et secundicerius et primicerius defensorum cum omnibus regionariis et notariis ascendunt ad altare et stant ad dextris et sinistris.

98. And he returns to the Chair. At once the *primicerius* and the *secundicerius* [of the notaries] and the *primicerius* of the *defensores* with all the regionaries and notaries go up to the altar and stand at the right and left.

99. Nomincolator vero et sacellarius et notarius vicedomini, cum dixerint *Agnus Dei*, tunc ascendunt ad stare ante faciem pontificis, ut annuat eis scribere nomina eorum qui invitandi sunt sive ad mensam pontificis per nomincolatorem, sive ad vicemdomini per notarium ipsius; quorum nomina ut conpleverint, descendunt ad invitandum.

99. When they have chanted the *Agnus Dei*, the *nomincolator* and the *sacellarius* and the notary of the *vicedominus* then go up to stand before the pope, so that he may motion them to write the names of those who are to be invited either to the pope's table by the *nomincolator*, or to the [table] of the *vicedominus* by his notary; when they have written down their names, they go down to invite [them].

100. Nam archidiaconus levat calicem et dat eum subdiacono regionario et tenet iuxta cornu altaris dextrum.

100. Now the archdeacon takes the chalice and gives it to the regionary subdeacon and he holds it beside the right side of the altar.

101. Et accedentes subdiaconi sequentes cum acolytis qui saccula portant a dextris et a sinistris altaris, extendentibus acolytis brachia cum sacculis, stant subdiaconi sequentes a fronte ut parent sinus sacculorum archidiacono ad ponendas oblationes, prius a dextris, deinde a sinistris.

101. And the attendant subdeacons approach with the acolytes who carry the sacks from the right and left of the altar; when the acolytes extend their arms with the sacks, the attendant subdeacons stand in front so that they may prepare the hollow of the sacks for the archdeacon to place the [lay] offerings, first on the right, then on the left.

102. Tunc acolyti vadunt dextra leuaque per episcopos circum altare;

102. Then the acolytes go to the right and left through the bishops around the altar;

reliqui descendunt ad presbiteros, ut confrangant hostias.

the rest descend to the priests, so that they may break the sacrificial gifts.

103. Patena praecedat iuxta sedem, deferentibus eam duobus subdiaconibus regionariis diaconibus ut frangant.

103. The paten goes ahead close to the Chair, carried by two regionary subdeacons to the deacons that they may break [the consecrated bread].

104. Sed illi aspiciunt ad faciem pontificis, ut eis annuat frangere; et dum annuerit, resalutato pontifice, confringunt.

104. Now they look towards the pope's face, as he signals them to break [the consecrated bread]; and when he signals, returning the salutation to the pope, they carry out the fraction.

105. Et archidiaconus, evacuato altare oblationibus, respicit in scolam et annuit eis ut dicant *Agnus Dei* et vadit ad patenam cum ceteris.

105. And the archdeacon, having cleared the altar of [lay] offerings, looks to the *schola* and signals to them that they may chant the *Agnus Dei* and goes to the paten with the others.

106. Expleta confractione, diaconus minor, levata de subdiacono patena, defert ad sedem, ut communicet pontifex.

106. When the fraction is completed, the lesser deacon, having taken the paten from the subdeacon, carries [it] to the Chair, so that the pope may receive Communion.

107. Qui, dum communicaverit, de ipsa Sancta quam momorderat ponit in calice in manus archidiaconi dicendo: *Fiat commixtio et consecratio corporis et sanguinis domini nostri Iesu Christi accipientibus nobis in vitam aeternam. Amen.*

107. When he has received Communion, he places a fragment of the same Sacred Element that he had bitten into the chalice in the archdeacon's hand, saying: *May the mixing and consecration of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ [bring us] who receive it into eternal life. Amen.*

Pax tecum. Et cum spiritu tuo.

Peace be with you. And with your spirit.

Et ita confirmatur ab archidiacono.

And so he is given the consecrated wine by the archdeacon.

108. Deinde venit archidiaconus cum calice ad cornu altaris et adnuntiat stationem et refuso parum de calice in sciffo inter manus acolyti, accedunt primum episcopi ad sedem, ut

108. Then the archdeacon with the chalice comes to the corner of the altar and announces the [Communion] station and after pouring a little from the chalice into the *sciffus* in the acolyte's hands, the bishops approach the Chair first, so that

communicent de manu pontificis
secundum ordinem.

109. Sed et presbiteri omnes ascendunt
ut communicent ad altare.

110. Episcopus autem primus accipit
calicem de manu archidiaconi et stat in
cornu altaris sequentis ordinis usque ad
primicerium defensorum.

111. Deinde archidiaconus, accepto
de manu illius calice, refundit in
sciffum quem supra diximus et tradit
calicem subdiacono regionario, qui
tradit ei pugillarem cum quo confirmat
populum.

112. Calicem autem accipit subdiaconus
sequens, dat acolyto, quem ille revocat in
paratorium.

113. Qui dum confirmaverit, id est
quos papa communicat, descendit
pontifex a sede, cum primicerio
notariorum et primicerio defensorum
tenentibus ei manus, ut communicet
eos qui in senatorio sunt, post quem
archidiaconus confirmat.

114. Post archidiaconem episcopi
communicant populum, annuente
eis primicerio cum manu sub planeta
percontato pontifici; post eos diaconi
confirmant.

they may receive Communion from the
pope's hand according to their order.

109. But then all the priests too go up to
receive Communion at the altar.

110. The first bishop, however, takes the
chalice from the archdeacon's hand and
stands at the corner of altar, [giving the
consecrated wine to members] of the
following orders – up to the *primicerius* of
the *defensores*.

111. Then the archdeacon, having received
the chalice from his hand, pours it into
the *sciffus* that we mentioned above and
hands the chalice over to the regionary
subdeacon, who delivers to him a liturgical
straw with which he gives the consecrated
wine to the people.

112. The attendant subdeacon receives
the chalice, gives [it] to the acolyte, who
brings [it] back to the sacristy.

113. When [the archdeacon] has given the
consecrated wine, that is those to whom the
pope gives Communion, the pope descends
from the Chair, with the *primicerius* of
the notaries and the *primicerius* of the
defensores holding his hands, so that he may
give Communion to those who are in the
senatorium, after which the archdeacon gives
[them] the consecrated wine.

114. After the archdeacon [gives the
consecrated wine], the bishops give
Communion to the people, the *primicerius*
[of the notaries], having consulted the pope,
signaling to them with [his] hand under
[his] chasuble; afterwards the deacons give
them the consecrated wine.

115. Deinde transeunt in parte sinistra et faciunt similiter.

116. Presbiteri autem, annuente primicerio, iussu pontificis communicant populum et ipsi vicissim confirmant.

117. Nam, mox ut pontifex coeperit in senatorio communicare, statim scola incipit antiphonam ad communionem et psallunt usquedum communicato omni populo, annuat pontifex ut dicant *Gloria patri*; et tunc repetitio versu quiescunt.

118. Nam pontifex, mox ut communicaverit in partes mulierum, redit in sedem et communicat regionarios per ordinem et eos qui in filo steterant et in diebus festis de scola duodecim. Nam, ceteris diebus, in presbiterio ubi potuerint communicent.

119. Post omnes hos redeunt nomincolator et sacellarius et acolytus qui patenam tenet et qui manustergium tenet et qui aquam dat ad sedem communicant.

120. Post pontificem archidiaconus eos confirmat.

121. Adstat autem subdiaconus regionarius ante faciem pontificis, ut annuat ei. Ille vero contemplant populum si iam communicati sunt et annuit ei.

115. Then they cross to the left side and proceed in similar fashion.

116. The priests, at a sign from the *primicerius* [of the notaries] [and] at the pope's command, give Communion to the people and they in turn give the consecrated wine.

117. Now, as soon as the pope has begun to give Communion to [those] in the *senatorium*, the *schola* immediately begins the Communion antiphon and they chant until all the people have received Communion; let the pope signal that they may chant the *Gloria patri*; and then they are silent following the repetition of the verse.

118. Now as soon as the pope has given Communion in the women's sections, he returns to the Chair and gives Communion to the regionaries in order and to those who had stood in line and on the feast days to twelve [members] of the *schola*. Now, on other days, they receive Communion in the presbytery whenever they can.

119. Returning after all these, the *nomincolator* and *sacellarius* and the acolyte who holds the paten and he who holds the liturgical cloth and he who gives water, receive Communion at the Chair.

120. After the pope [gives Communion], the archdeacon gives them the consecrated wine.

121. The regionary subdeacon stands before the pope, so that he may signal to him. He, surveying the people [to see] if they have already received Communion, signals to him.

122. Et ille vadit ad humerum, aspicit ad primum scolae, faciens crucem in fronte sua, annuit ei dicere *Gloriam*; et ille, resalutato, dicit *Gloria, Sicut erat*, et versum.

123. Finita autem antiphona, surgit pontifex cum archidiacono et veniens ad altare dat orationem ad complendum.

124. Qua finita, cui praeceperit archidiaconus de diaconibus aspicit ad pontificem, ut ei annuit, et dicit ad populum: *Ite missa est*. Resp.: *Deo gratias*.

125. Tunc septem cereostata praecedunt pontificem et subdiaconus regionarius cum turibulo ad secretarium.

126. Discendente autem illo in presbiterio, episcopi primum dicunt: *Iube, domne, benedicere*. Respondit: *Benedicat nos dominus*. Respondunt: *Amen*; post episcopos presbiteri, deinde monachi, deinde scola, deinde milites draconarii, id est qui signa portant; post eos baiuli; post eos cereostatarii; post quos acolyti qui rugam observant; post eos extra presbiterium cruces portantes, deinde mansionarii iuniores; et intrant in secretarium.

122. And he [the regionary subdeacon] goes to the [pope's] side, looks at the first of the *schola*, making a cross on his forehead, signals to him to chant the *Gloria [patri]*; and he, returning the salutation, chants *Glory, As it was*, and the verse.

123. When the antiphon is finished, the pope rises with the archdeacon and, coming to the altar, delivers the final prayer.

124. After it is finished, whichever deacon the archdeacon has appointed glances towards the pope, so that he may signal to him, and chants to the people: *Go, the Mass is finished*. Resp[onse]: *Thanks be to God*.

125. Then the seven candlesticks and the regionary subdeacon with the thurible go ahead of the pope to the *secretarium*.

126. When he [the pope] descends into the presbytery, the bishops first say: *Deign, O lord, to give the blessing*. He responds: *May the Lord bless us*. They respond: *Amen*; after the bishops the priests, then the monks, then the *schola*, then the *draconarius* soldiers, that is those who carry the standards; after them the porters; after them the candle-bearers; after them the acolytes who guard the gate; after them, outside of the presbytery, the cross-bearers, then the junior sextons; and they enter into the *secretarium*.

Appendix 3

Commentary on the Translation of the First Roman Ordo

OR I will never be mistaken for a literary product. Rather than transform it into something stylistically elegant, what I have attempted to do instead is to render its technical phrasing as accurately as possible in English. It is my hope that this translation will serve as a complement to my work in the book and as an aid to comprehending OR I. It is best consulted together with the other appendices. It should be stressed that this is by no means a comprehensive commentary of OR I (which would require an entire volume), but instead aims at explaining some of the more difficult decisions in the translation and defining the document's specialized vocabulary, which may be unfamiliar to readers.

This translation should be read in conjunction with my article "The Fates of Liturgies: Towards a History of the First Roman Ordo," in *Antiphon*, 11 (2007), 43–77. In this article I argue that the original text was written at the end of the seventh century during the reign of Pope Sergius I (687–701). Several chapters were added (OR I:1–6) or revised (OR I:7, 13, 24–6, 46, and 65) in Rome in approximately the first half of the eighth century. A copy of OR I then was taken out of Rome around the mid-eighth century; the form of the text at this point is the one presented and translated here.

For their assistance with the preparation of this translation, I am deeply indebted to Stephen D'Evelyn, Joseph Dyer, and Daniel Sheerin, all of whom generously read this entire translation and offered numerous suggestions for improvement. I also consulted the three major translations of OR I: E.G.C.F. Atchley, *Ordo Romanus Primus* (London, 1905), 116–49; the partial translation by R.C.D. Jasper and G.J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*, 2nd edn (New York, 1980), 125–9; and A. Griffiths, *Ordo Romanus Primus: Text and Translation with Introduction and Notes* (Norwich, 2012). All three used different versions of the text of OR I, which limited their utility for my translation. In lieu of a standard edition existing when he wrote, Atchley devised his own composite edition.¹ The other two translations used MS

¹ He combined elements from Jean Mabillon's edition of OR I in *Museum italicum*, 2 vols (Paris, 1724), ii, 3–16 (which now be found in *PL*, lxxviii, 937A–948B); and OR VI (*Les Ordines Romani*, ii, 239–50).

St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 614, a text significantly modified north of the Alps, as a base text.

My notes below are keyed to the chapters in OR I in which difficult terms or translations are found. In cases in which a term appears in several chapters, I discuss it wherever it first appears. Several items are discussed in greater detail in the main body of the book, and can be consulted by perusing the index in the back of the book.

OR I:1 – Rome was divided into one of seven ecclesiastical districts known as a *regio* (pl. *regiones*).² Members of the Roman clergy generally performed liturgical functions in only one of these regions.

“Reginary” was an honor bestowed on certain clergy by the pope; this name or its plural “regionaries” could also be a free-standing title for those who received the honor.³

OR I:4 – The term *militaris persona* is unclear. The translation I have adopted (“military person”) is the most neutral English equivalent. In the late Roman world the related term *militia* was more ambiguous: it referred to any imperial service, whether military or civil.⁴ In late-seventh-century Rome, however, the terms *militia* and *exercitus* seem to have been used interchangeably to mean “army”: someone in the *militia* at this point was a soldier.⁵ This chapter shows that the power brokers of Roman society were either associated with the clergy or the military.⁶

The term employed throughout OR I for the pope (*pontifex*) can be translated as “pontiff” and refer to any bishop. Since the pope is the bishop of Rome, however, “pope” is the best translation in this case.

OR I:6 – *Apostolicus* was a free-standing adjectival noun used in reference to the pope. It evokes the spiritual roots of the papacy’s power as a successor of

² C. Pietri, “Régions ecclésiastiques et paroisses romaines,” in *Actes du XI^e Congrès international d’Archéologie chrétienne*, 3 vols (Rome, 1989), ii, 1035–67; and reprinted in *Christiana respublica: éléments d’une enquête sur le christianisme antique*, 3 vols (Rome, 1997), i, 173–200. For a map of the regions, see H. Geertman, *Hic Fecit Basilicam. Studi sul Liber pontificalis e gli edifici ecclesiastici di Roma da Silvestro a Silverio*, ed. S. de Blaauw and C.E. van der Laan (Leuven; Dudley, MA, 2004), frontispiece.

³ O. Bertolini, “Per la storia delle diaconie romane nell’alto medioevo sino alla fine del secolo VIII,” in *Scritti scelti di storia medioevale*, ed. O. Banti (Livorno, 1968), 309–460, at 346–7.

⁴ M.M. Mango, “Status and its Symbols,” in *The Oxford History of Byzantium*, ed. C. Mango (Oxford and New York, 2002), 60–64, at 61.

⁵ See especially LP (Mommsen), 212–13.

⁶ C. Diehl, *Etudes sur l’administration byzantine dans l’exarchat de Ravenne (568–751)* (Paris, 1888), 146.

the Apostle Peter. This term can be found in biographies of popes written both within⁷ and outside of Rome.⁸

Statio in this chapter refers to one of the stational churches in Rome, which were incorporated into a cycle of churches in the city in which the pope held Masses over the course of the ecclesiastical year from approximately the fifth to the early-fourteenth centuries.⁹

When the pope first arrived at one of the stational churches, he did not enter the main church building first, but instead entered the sacristy, which is referred to as the *secretarium*¹⁰ or *sacrarium*.¹¹ The more common name in Rome was the *secretarium*, a name that has connotations of a space reserved for certain people.¹² This name described a small room set off from the church in which preparation for the Mass took place. It was located close to the entrance of the church.¹³ The *secretarium* at San Pietro in Vaticano was on the south side of the building off to the side of the west arm of the atrium, near the entrance to the church.¹⁴ The *secretarium* of the Basilica of the Savior was located on the south side of the facade.¹⁵ The *secretarium* of Santa Maria Maggiore bordered the narthex close to the entrance of the basilica.¹⁶

OR I:1-6 – I have separated these chapters from the rest of the document since I have argued they were not a part of the original version of OR I.

OR I:7 – A *defensor* (pl. *defensores*) was a legal minister of the pope.¹⁷ They executed various functions, all aimed at preserving the rights and interests of

⁷ LP (Mommson), 186–7; LP (Duchesne), i, 487.

⁸ *The Earliest Life of Gregory the Great by an Anonymous Monk of Whitby*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave (Cambridge, 1985), 78, 82, 134.

⁹ J.F. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stational Liturgy*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 228 (Rome, 1987).

¹⁰ OR I:29 (twice), 32, 37, 40, 44, 125, 126.

¹¹ OR I:6, 23.

¹² S. de Blaauw, *Cultus et decor: Liturgia e architettura nella Roma tardoantica e medievale*, 2 vols, *Studi e Testi*, 355–6 (Vatican City, 1994), i, 74.

¹³ Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 74.

¹⁴ R. Lanciani, *Forma Urbis Romae* (Rome, 1990 [1893–1901]), plate XIII; R. Krautheimer, *Corpus basilicarum christianorum Romae*, 5 vols (Vatican City, 1937–1977), v, 218, figure 195; Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, ii, 469–70 and, in his appendix, figure 19.

¹⁵ Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 141–2.

¹⁶ Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 417.

¹⁷ B. Fischer, “Die Entwicklung des Instituts der Defensores in der roemischen Kirche,” *Ephemerides liturgicae*, 48 (1934), 443–54; L. Halphen, *Etudes sur l'administration de Rome au Moyen Age (751–1252)* (Paris, 1907), 124–30; T.F.X. Noble, *The Republic of St. Peter: The Birth of the Papal State, 680–825* (Philadelphia, 1984), 222–3, 227; R.E. Reynolds, “The Organisation, Law and Liturgy of the Western Church, 700–900,” in *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Volume 2, c.700–c.900*, ed. R. McKitterick (Cambridge and

the Church. They carried out the pope's will, managing estates, enforcing the decisions of legal cases, and protecting the oppressed in Rome.

OR I:9 – The *primicerius* of the notaries served as secretary and papal advisor at synods, and he was part of the council that ruled Rome during a papal interregnum.¹⁸ His title literally means that he was the first to inscribe his name on a wax tablet.

OR I:10 – In the Lateran palace, the most important ministers were the *vicedominus* and *maior domus*.¹⁹ Since both offices appear to be comparable to a mayor of the palace, it is difficult to see exactly how they differ. It may be that the *vicedominus* handled the central administration of the palace while the *maior domus* oversaw domestic functions. The duties of the *vicedominus* were onerous enough for him to require his own notary.²⁰

The *vesterarius* was the guardian of treasure, vessels, and precious furnishings.²¹

The *nominculator* was the master of ceremonies of the papal palace, handling audiences, protocol, and petitioners.²²

The chief financial officers of the pope were the *arcarius* and the *sacellarius*, but only the latter appears in OR I.²³ The *arcarius* was the main papal treasurer and controlled income, and the *sacellarius* was keeper of the privy purse and dispersed funds. It may be that the *sacellarius* participated in the liturgy as a kind of representative of the papal treasury. In fact, he fulfilled one of his major functions – dispersing funds – in OR I:15. Pope Gregory II (715–731) had once been a *sacellarius*.²⁴

OR I:15 – The Easter Sunday Mass would be held in Santa Maria Maggiore, the basilica built by the papacy in the fifth century on the Esquiline Hill.²⁵ The pope progressed up the ancient and modern Via Merulana that connects the

New York, 1995), 587–621, at 611; J. Richards, *The Popes and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages*, 476–752 (London and Boston, 1979), 292–3.

¹⁸ Noble, *Republic*, 207; *Liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum*, ed. H. Foerster (Bern, 1958), 113–14 (V59) = 211 (C58) = 318–20 (A53); 117–19 (V61) = 215–17 (C60) = 326–8 (A55); 119–20 (V62) = 217–18 (C61) = 328 (A56); 120–21 (V63) = 218–19 (C62) = 329–31 (A57).

¹⁹ Richards, *Popes and the Papacy*, 298. Cf. P. Llewellyn, *Rome in the Dark Ages* (London, 1971), 121–2.

²⁰ OR I:99.

²¹ Noble, *Republic*, 226; Reynolds, “Organisation,” 612.

²² Llewellyn, *Rome in the Dark Ages*, 122; Noble, *Republic*, 226; Richards, *Popes and the Papacy*, 297–8.

²³ Halphen, *Etudes sur l'administration*, 38–40; Llewellyn, *Rome in the Dark Ages*, 122; Noble, *Republic*, 225; Reynolds, “Organisation,” 612; Richards, *Popes and the Papacy*, 297.

²⁴ LP (Duchesne), i, 396.

²⁵ For this church, see V. Saxer, *Sainte-Marie-Majeure: une basilique de Rome dans l'histoire de la ville et de son église* (Rome, 2001).

Lateran with Santa Maria Maggiore. The place called Merolanas is also on the Via Merulana, most likely at an arcade of the Aqua Claudia, the aqueduct that traverses the street.²⁶ Since the pope officiated at the ceremonies in the Basilica of the Savior during the Easter Vigil, this was the first official announcement of the baptisms done in his absence.

The *sacellarius* (as his office required) handed over a gold coin, a *solidus*, to the reginary notary. There was nothing unusual about payment in coin at this time and place. In the seventh and eighth centuries, Rome was still monetized, and a variety of coins, some of them minted centuries beforehand, were in regular circulation in the city; gold, however, was scarcer in comparison to silver and bronze coinage.²⁷ A gold coin was a significant amount of money: the imposition of a tribute of a *solidus* a year on each Roman citizen by the Lombard King Aistulf (d. 756) was thought to be a heavy burden.²⁸

I have chosen to render the verb *salutare* in OR I as “greet,” even though at times in OR I it refers to inanimate objects.²⁹ The verb likely implies that the person or thing in question is kissed,³⁰ but OR I also uses the verb *osculare*, which unambiguously means “to kiss,” and necessitates that the two be distinguished in translation.

The verb *dicere* refers to both chanting and speaking. In cases in which it is clear that chanting is involved, I have translated it as such. Otherwise, I have translated the term more literally as “to say,” though most prayers were likely delivered in the liturgical recitative, a simple form of chant.

OR I:16 – *Ad remissa* is a reference to the atrium of San Pietro in Vaticano in the northwestern corner of the city, approximately where the obelisk now stands.³¹

OR I:17 – The *reflexio* of the portico of San Paolo fuori le Mura is probably a bend or fork in the road on the Via Ostiensis in the southern part of the city.

²⁶ LP (Duchesne), i, 489 (“Et properantes venerunt usque in Merulanam, ad arcum depictum qui est secus viam quae ducit ad ecclesiam sanctae Dei genetricis ad Praesepe ...”). See also *Le liber censuum de l’Eglise romaine*, ed. P. Fabre and L. Duchesne, 3 vols (Paris, 1889–1952), i, 297 (“Cum autem per Merulam transierit ...”); LP (Duchesne), i, 515 n. 11; Gregory I, *Registrum*, i, 248. For discussion, see I. Herklotz, “Der Campus Lateranensis im Mittelalter,” *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 22 (1984), 1–43, at 4–5, 8–17. The coordinates for this position are Latitude: 41°53’14.74”N and Longitude: 12°30’16.43”E.

²⁷ A. Rovelli, “La circolazione monetaria a Roma nei secoli VII e VIII: Nuovi dati per la storia economica di Roma nell’alto medioevo,” in *Roma medievale: aggiornamenti*, ed. P. Delogu (Florence, 1998), 79–91.

²⁸ LP (Duchesne), i, 441.

²⁹ Cf. OR I:29, 36, 48, 51, 82.

³⁰ Jungmann, *MS*, i, 406 n. 20.

³¹ LP (Duchesne), i, 411 n. 14. The coordinates of this position are Latitude: 41°54’8.17”N and Longitude: 12°27’35.95”E.

This spot was near the beginning of the ancient portico that covered the street to the basilica.³²

OR I:15–17 – OR I was originally designed to describe the liturgy of Easter Week,³³ although the ceremony was likely to have been similar to the papal Mass on other liturgical feasts.

OR I:18 – *Patriarchum* refers to the papal palace of the Lateran, the nerve center of papal administration located in the southeastern corner of Rome.³⁴ The first securely dated references to this term appear in the late-seventh century.³⁵

OR I:19 – The *evangelium* (evangelary or evangeliary) was a liturgical book that contained the Gospel readings.³⁶

OR I:20 – The *apostulum* (epistolary) was a liturgical book that contained the first reading, normally from the New Testament, though some were from the Old Testament or the Acts of the Apostles.³⁷

OR I:21 – The liturgical vessels are given approximate equivalents in English where they exist. The *sciffus* (also spelled *scyphus*), a huge chalice used for Communion, has no obvious English translation. Scholars still only have an imprecise idea of the carrying capacities of the various vessels.³⁸

The *cantatorium* was a specialized chant book that contained only the gradual, *Alleluia*, and tract.³⁹

The Church (or Basilica) of the Savior was the seventh- and eighth-century name for the modern San Giovanni in Laterano, located in the southeastern part of the city.⁴⁰

It is unclear who the “they” is who are responsible for taking out the items from the Church of the Savior, though it is likely to have been the junior sextons

³² Lanciani, *Forma Urbis Romae*, plate XLIV. The coordinates for this position are Latitude: 41°52'32.00"N and Longitude: 12°28'50.76"E.

³³ J. Kösters, *Studien zu Mabillons römischen Ordines* (Münster, 1905), 5. OR I:15–17 only specify Easter Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, whereas OR I:5 states that the *ordo* was in effect for all of Easter Week.

³⁴ OR I:7, 18.

³⁵ Two references occur in LP (Mommsen), 210. W.M. Plöchl, *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts*, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Vienna, 1960), i, 317; Noble, *Republic*, 189.

³⁶ E. Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books from the Beginning to the Thirteenth Century*, trans. M. Beaumont (Collegeville, MN, 1998), 89–100.

³⁷ Palazzo, *History of Liturgical Books*, 89–100.

³⁸ Though see H. Geertman, “La capacità di metretae, amae e scyphi nel *Liber pontificalis*,” *Rivista di archeologia cristiana*, 63 (1987), 193–201; and reprinted in *idem*, *Hic Fecit Basilicam*, 45–52.

³⁹ J. McKinnon, *The Advent Project: The Later-seventh-century Creation of the Roman Mass Proper* (Berkeley, 2000), 222.

⁴⁰ For this church, see esp. *San Giovanni in Laterano*, ed. C. Pietrangeli, *Chiese monumentali d'Italia* (Florence, 1990).

(*mansionarii*). The head sexton ultimately hands the items over to be carried and the junior sextons are not given any other job, though they appear once more in OR I:126.

OR I:24 – The *supplementarius* is likely to have served as a papal almoner.⁴¹

The presbytery (*presbiterium*) was an enclosed chancel, which extended slightly into the nave and separated the clergy from the rest of the congregation.⁴²

OR I:26 – A *titulus* or titular church was one of the 25 or so “parish churches” in the city of Rome.⁴³ The term “titulus” initially referred to an inscription on a house that named the owner.

For a description of the job of a mayor of the palace (*maior domus*), see my note under OR I:10. I have translated *maior domus* fairly literally as “mayor of the palace.”

The father (*pater*) of a *diaconia* was the administrator of a *diaconia*, an institution with Eastern roots that provided charitable assistance to the urban poor.⁴⁴

OR I:29 – The term “supported by” refers to the courtly ritual of *sustentatio*, in which two ministers accompanied the pope while holding either his right or left hand.⁴⁵

OR I:30 – A chasuble was a wide square or circular vestment with a hole for the head but without any sleeves, similar to a poncho.⁴⁶

⁴¹ R.E. Reynolds, “Clerics in the Early Middle Ages: Hierarchies and Functions,” in *Clerics in the Early Middle Ages: Hierarchy and Image* (Aldershot and Brookfield, VT, 1999), no. I, 1–31, at 12.

⁴² T.F. Mathews, “An Early Roman Chancel Arrangement and its Liturgical Functions,” in *Rivista di archeologia Cristiana*, 38 (1962), 73–95.

⁴³ Llewellyn, *Rome in the Dark Ages*, 121; Reynolds, “Organisation,” 609.

⁴⁴ O. Bertolini, “Per la storia delle diaconie romane,” esp. 335–9, though Bertolini’s contention that the *pater* was head of all of the *diaconiae* based upon OR I:26 stretches the evidence; U. Falesiedi, *Le diaconie: I servizi assistenziali nella Chiesa antica* (Rome, 1995); G. Ferrari, *Early Roman Monasteries: Notes for the History of the Monasteries and Convents at Rome from the V through the X Century* (Vatican City, 1957), 353–61; R. Hermes, “Die stadtrömischen Diakonien,” *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte*, 91 (1996), 1–120; A. Milella, “Le diaconie romane tra il VI e l’VIII secolo,” in *Cultura e promozione umana: La cura del corpo e dello spirito dai primi secoli cristiani al Medioevo: Contributi e attualizzazioni ulteriori* (Troina, 2000), 83–99. It remains unclear whether the *pater* was a member of the laity or the clergy, but it is at least possible that the *pater* was a cleric and the *dispensator* was the lay version of the same office.

⁴⁵ E. Jerg, “Die ‘Sustentatio’ in der römischen Liturgie vor dem Hintergrund des kaiserlichen Hofzeremoniells,” *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 80 (1958), 316–24.

⁴⁶ J. Braun, *Die liturgische Gewandung im Occident und Orient: nach Ursprung und Entwicklung, Verwendung und Symbolik* (Freiburg im Breisgau and St. Louis, MO, 1907), 149–247.

ORI:32 – The *secundicerius* was a deputy to the *primicerius* of the notaries. He handled papal finances and property, and assisted in issuing papal documents.⁴⁷

The *primicerius* of the *defensores* was the head of *defensores*, comparable to the position the *primicerius* of the notaries held in relation to the notaries.

I have translated the “sequens” subdeacons as “attendant” subdeacons. The verb *sequor*, from which their title derives,⁴⁸ means to follow or come after, and they correspondingly follow other subdeacons in precedence. A better (if less colloquial) translation for this group of subdeacons may be “second” subdeacons, since *sequens*, like *secundus* (second), is a participle of *sequor*.⁴⁹

The pallium was a white woolen scarf with four black crosses which hung on the pope’s breast and shoulders.⁵⁰

OR I:33 – The ostiary (*ostiarius*) was primarily a doorman, but his duties encompassed watching the church building, greeting the faithful, and ringing the bells.⁵¹

OR I:34 – The alb was a long, white linen vestment with narrow sleeves.⁵²

The amice was an oblong or square linen cloth placed over the neck and shoulders.⁵³

Dalmatics were white vestments made of linen or wool, sometimes ornamented with stripes, with very wide sleeves that extended down to the feet.⁵⁴

ORI:37 – The *schola cantorum* or simply *schola* was the professionally trained choir who chanted at the pope’s Masses; it was made up of both adult male and boy members.⁵⁵ The representative of the *schola* who identifies the lector and cantor here is seemingly the *archiparafronista*.⁵⁶

⁴⁷ Noble, *Republic*, 207.

⁴⁸ *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. P.G.W. Glare (Oxford and New York, 1996), 1741–2; A. Ernout and A. Millet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: Histoire des mots*, 4th edn (Paris, 1967), 616.

⁴⁹ Ernout and Millet, *Dictionnaire étymologique*, 608. An alternative translation is the “attached subdeacons” of *The Book of Pontiffs (Liber Pontificalis): The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715*, trans. R. Davis, 2nd edn, Translated Texts for Historians, 6 (Liverpool, 2000).

⁵⁰ Braun, *Liturgische Gewandung*, 620–74.

⁵¹ K.G. Sender, “Ostiärer,” in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, ed. W. Kasper and K. Baumgartner, 11 vols (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1993–2001), vii, 1202–3.

⁵² Braun, *Liturgische Gewandung*, 57–101.

⁵³ Braun, *Liturgische Gewandung*, 21–52 (esp. at 23).

⁵⁴ Braun, *Liturgische Gewandung*, 247–305.

⁵⁵ J. Dyer, “The Schola Cantorum and its Roman Milieu in the Early Middle Ages,” in *De Musica et Cantu: Studien zur Geschichte der Kirchenmusik und der Oper*, ed. P. Cahn and A.K. Heimer (Hildesheim and New York, 1993), 19–40.

⁵⁶ Cf. OR I:39.

OR I:38 – Since most adult members of the *schola* were subdeacons,⁵⁷ it is likely that the cantor chosen for the Mass was also a subdeacon.

OR I:39 – The *archiparafonista* may have been the director of the *schola*; he certainly held an important role in its operation.⁵⁸

OR I:43 – The *parafonistae* were adults who helped to train the boy singers of the *schola*.⁵⁹

ORI:48 – I have translated *Sancta* as “Sacred Element.” It is a circumlocution for the Eucharist.⁶⁰

OR I:49 – The weekly or hebdomadary bishops were bishops from neighboring cities who assisted the pope with the Mass.⁶¹ The bishops took weekly turns celebrating Mass within the city, which is why they were called *hebdomadarii* from the Latin *hebdomada* (week).

OR I:50 – The *oratorium* in this chapter is a rug, rather than a kneeler or faldstool.⁶² The main proof comes from the Romano-German Pontifical, which refers to shaking out an *oratorium*.⁶³

ORI:58, 60, 66 – These chapters, which appeared in Michel Andrieu’s edition, have been omitted from this presentation because they were interpolations. For further information, see my Appendix 1.

OR I:67 – The context requires that *brachium* be understood as “hand” rather than “arm” in this chapter.

OR I:69 – The leading men (*principes*) in society sat in the section known as the *senatorium*; the corresponding section for noble women was the *pars mulierum* (the women’s section).⁶⁴

OR I distinguishes between offerings of bread and wine given by the faithful (*oblaciones*) and the clergy (*oblata*).⁶⁵ I have rendered this difference in my translation by specifying lay and clerical offerings.

⁵⁷ Dyer, “Schola Cantorum,” 33.

⁵⁸ Dyer, “Schola Cantorum,” 35.

⁵⁹ Dyer, “Schola Cantorum,” 36.

⁶⁰ A. Blaise, *Le vocabulaire latin des principaux thèmes liturgiques* (Turnhout, 1966), 96.

⁶¹ A. Chavasse, “Les *episcopi* dans la liturgie de l’Urbs, au VII^e au VIII^e siècle,” in *La liturgie de la ville de Rome du V^e au VIII^e siècle. Une liturgie conditionnée par l’organisation de la vie in Urbe et Extra Muros* (Rome, 1993), 337–42. The cities from which the bishops came were Ostia, Porto, Silva Candida, Albano, Velletri, Palestrina, and Gabii.

⁶² Jungmann, *MS*, i, 92 n. 12.

⁶³ *Le Pontifical romano-germanique du dixième siècle*, eds. C. Vogel and R. Elze, 3 vols, Studi e testi, 226–7, 269 (Vatican City, 1963–1972), iii, 57: “Si ibidem oratorium habuerint in porta, ibi excutunt.”

⁶⁴ E. Benedictis, “The Senatorium and Matroneum in the Early Roman Church,” *Rivista di archeologia Cristiana*, 57 (1981), 69–85.

⁶⁵ M.P. Ellebracht, *Remarks on the Vocabulary of the Ancient Orations in the Missale Romanum* (Nijmegen, 1963), 80–83.

OR I:74 – For the women's section, see my note under OR I:69.

The *confessio* was a niche or larger subterranean space within, below, or near the altar that housed relics or a venerated tomb.⁶⁶

OR I:79 – Other than his role in this liturgy, the *oblationarius* subdeacon supplied the candles, bread, and wine for feasts of the martyrs in the cemeteries.⁶⁷

OR I:88 – This chapter has been treated as representative of the proper method of interpreting liturgical texts.⁶⁸ I have opted to translate *intrat in canonem* as “begins the Canon,” which if correct would mean that the preface was at this time not considered a part of the Canon in Rome.⁶⁹ This is a debatable point, however. An alternative translation is “resumes the Canon.” Josef A. Jungmann thought that the Canon already started with the preface, and in OR I:88 the pope was merely continuing it by delivering the *Te igitur* by himself.⁷⁰ There is evidence to support this view. The Gelasian Sacramentary included the preface under the prayers of the Canon.⁷¹ In the same prayer book the verb *intrare* means “resume,” and it is used specifically in reference to delivering a prayer.⁷²

In spite of these arguments, I am convinced that “begin” is the appropriate rendering of *intrare in* here. In the other chapters of OR I, *intrare in* is employed to describe entering into or penetrating the *secretarium*, not resuming to do anything.⁷³ Jungmann's interpretation of a passage from Amalar of Metz is also questionable. Rather than state that “*Te igitur*” comes in the middle of the Canon (as Jungmann argues), it seems that Amalar referred to “*Te igitur*” as a shorthand to explain what the Canon is, which (it is implied) begins with these words.⁷⁴ Finally, a rubric added to the Romanized Stowe Missal shortly after

⁶⁶ Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 84; J. Braun, *Der christliche Altar in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Munich, 1924), 66–86, 192–207.

⁶⁷ Reynolds, “Clerics in the Early Middle Ages,” 12.

⁶⁸ A.A. Häussling, “Dokumente der Liturgiegeschichte – wie verstehen? Erwägungen über einen Satz des Ordo Romanus primus,” *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 107 (1985), 24–30.

⁶⁹ F. Probst, *Die abendländische Messe: Vom fünften bis zum achten Jahrhundert* (Münster, 1896), 392.

⁷⁰ Jungmann, *MS*, ii, 128–30.

⁷¹ *Liber sacramentorum Romanae Aeclesiae ordinis anni circuli* (Cod. Vat. Reg. lat. 316/Paris Bibl. Nat. 7193, 41/56) (*Sacramentarium Gelasianum*), in Verbindung mit L. Eizenhöfer und P. Siffrin, ed. L.C. Mohlberg, 3rd edn, *Rerum ecclesiasticarum documenta, Series maior, Fontes*, 4 (Rome, 1981), 183–7 (formulae 1242–72).

⁷² *Liber sacramentorum Romanae Aeclesiae*, 33 (formula 195), 52 (formula 320), 61 (formula 381).

⁷³ OR I:29, 44, 126.

⁷⁴ Amalar of Metz, *Amalarii episcopi opera liturgica omnia*, ed. J.M. Hanssens, *Studi e testi*, 138–40 (Vatican City, 1948–1950), ii, 351: “Sequens vero subdiaconus in medio canone, id est cum dicitur ‘Te igitur,’ suscipit eam [patenam] ab acolyto, et stat ante altare cum patena, usque dum suscipiatur a subdiacono regionario.”

its initial transcription locates the Canon after the preface.⁷⁵ As I interpret the evidence, the scribe of the Gelasian Sacramentary was either relying on an older Roman or a non-Roman tradition of what the Canon encompassed.

OR I:101–2 – The acolytes are departing the papal church with the *fermentum* intended for the titular churches in the city of Rome.⁷⁶

OR I:102 – *Hostia* at this time did not yet acquire the later meaning of hosts, the thin, round, unleavened wafers of bread that would be consecrated and distributed. Here it means the Eucharistic gifts, with a connotation of sacrifice associated with them.⁷⁷

OR I:107 – The literal significance of *confirmare* here is “to give the consecrated wine,” though it might also have the more spiritual meaning of “to fortify.”

OR I:108 – The meaning of *statio* in this chapter is a “Communion station,” i.e. the place appointed to distribute the Eucharist within a church.⁷⁸

OR I:126 – The *draconarius* soldiers were one form of standard-bearers in the Roman army, present in Rome because it was still under imperial dominion.⁷⁹

The *ruga* was a gate or grill to the presbytery.⁸⁰

⁷⁵ *The Stowe Missal*, ed. G.F. Warner, 2 vols, Henry Bradshaw Society, 31–2 (London, 1906–1915), i, 10. On the Stowe Missal, see N.X. O’Donoghue, *The Eucharist in Pre-Norman Ireland* (Notre Dame, IN, 2011), 62–71. This missal is generally thought to be older than the common dating of c.800. The exact date of the rubric and the other modifications of Móel Cáich are unknown.

⁷⁶ On the *fermentum*, see J.F. Baldovin, “The Fermentum at Rome in the Fifth Century: A Reconsideration,” *Worship*, 79 (2005), 38–53; J.A. Jungmann, “Fermentum: A Symbol of Church Unity and its Observance in the Middle Ages,” in *idem*, *Pastoral Liturgy* (New York, 1962), 287–95; P. Nautin, “Le rite du ‘fermentum’ dans les églises urbaines de Rome,” *Ephemerides liturgicae*, 96 (1982), 510–22.

⁷⁷ Ellebracht, *Remarks*, 75–6.

⁷⁸ J.F. Romano, “Announcing the Station in Early-Medieval Rome: A New Interpretation of ‘statio’ in OR I, 108,” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 51 (2009), 345–51.

⁷⁹ T.S. Brown, *Gentlemen and Officers: Imperial Administration and Aristocratic Power in Byzantine Italy, A.D. 554–800* (London, 1984), 59; J.C.N. Coulston, “The ‘draco’ standard,” *Journal of Roman Military Equipment Studies*, 2 (1991), 101–14; M.C. Bishop and J.C.N. Coulston, *Roman Military Equipment from the Punic Wars to the Fall of Rome*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 2006), 187–9, 227; R. Grosse, “Die Fahnen in der römisch-byzantinischen Armee des 4.–10. Jahrhunderts,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 24 (1924), 359–72.

⁸⁰ Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, i, 76; Mathews, “An Early Roman Chancel Arrangement,” 78.

This page has been left blank intentionally

Appendix 4

Overview of the Papal Mass of the First Roman Ordo

In this overview, I have divided the Mass into two categories – what is today known as the Liturgy of the Word and the Liturgy of the Eucharist. In the ancient church, catechumens, those who were not fully initiated in the church, would only be allowed to stay for the first of these; they would be dismissed before the offertory. By the time of OR I, the basic assumption was that Rome was a Christian society, and thus there was no need to dismiss anyone.¹ Within the two larger groupings, I have distinguished six sections of the Mass: the opening, readings, offertory, Canon, Communion, and the conclusion. In this schematic overview of the Mass, I have provided the major actors of each liturgical act, the action they performed, the name of the chant or prayer that they performed (if any), and finally, the reference to OR I. I have given references to the texts of unchangeable chants and prayers in the footnotes.

Liturgy of the Word (OR I:44–65)

Section	Actor(s)	Action	Prayer/Chant	OR I Reference
Opening	<i>Schola cantorum</i>	Beginning of chant	Entrance antiphon (Introit)	OR I:44
	Attendant subdeacon with thurible, acolytes with candles, pope, archdeacon, second deacon	Procession	Entrance antiphon (Introit)	OR I:45–46
	Archdeacon, second deacon, pope	Deacons kiss pope's hands and hold them	Entrance antiphon (Introit)	OR I:45

¹ Jungmann, *MS*, i, 93, 606–14; and T. Klauser, *A Short History of the Western Liturgy: An Account and Some Reflections*, trans. J. Halliburton (London, 1969), 64.

	Deacons, regionary subdeacon, acolytes	Deacons remove their chasubles and pass them to regionary subdeacons, acolytes	Entrance antiphon (Introit)	OR I:47
	Acolytes with pyxes, attendant subdeacon, pope/deacon	Presentation of, bowing to, kissing of bread consecrated at previous Mass	Entrance antiphon (Introit)	OR I:48
	Acolytes with candles	Acolytes divide into two groups	Entrance antiphon (Introit)	OR I:49
	Pope	Pope bows head to altar, makes sign of cross on his own forehead	Entrance antiphon (Introit)	OR I:49
	Pope, bishop, archpriest, deacons	Pope's Kiss of Peace with the major clergy	Entrance antiphon (Introit)	OR I:49
	Pope to prior of <i>schola cantorum</i>	Indication of beginning of <i>Gloria patri</i>	Entrance antiphon (Introit)	OR I:50
	Prior of <i>schola cantorum</i> , <i>schola cantorum</i>	Bow to pope, intone chant	<i>Gloria patri</i> ²	OR I:50
	Fourth of the <i>schola cantorum</i>	Places rug in presbytery	<i>Gloria patri</i>	OR I:50
	Pope	Kneels on rug, says prayer	Pope's private prayer; <i>Gloria patri</i>	OR I:50
	Deacons	Rise, kiss sides of altar, return to pope	<i>Gloria patri</i>	OR I:50–51
	Pope	Rises, kisses evangelary and altar, goes to Chair, faces East	<i>Gloria patri</i> ; end of entrance antiphon	OR I:51
	<i>Schola cantorum</i> , the faithful	Chant	<i>Kyrie eleison</i> ³	OR I:52

² *L'ordinaire*, 60.

³ *L'ordinaire*, 62. Although I think that the verses were interspersed with petitions, the text of the petitions remains uncertain.

	Pope to <i>schola cantorum</i>	Indicates to <i>schola cantorum</i> changes in number of petitions	<i>Kyrie eleison</i>	OR I:52
	Prior of <i>schola cantorum</i>	Bows to pope	<i>Kyrie eleison</i>	OR I:52
	Pope	Intones chant <i>Gloria in excelsis Deo</i>	<i>Gloria in excelsis Deo</i> ⁴	OR I:53
	<i>Schola cantorum</i> , the faithful	Chant	<i>Gloria in excelsis Deo</i>	OR I:53
	Pope	Prayer	Collect	OR I:53
Readings	Regionary subdeacons	Approach altar, station themselves on left and right sides of altar	—	OR I:55
	Regionary subdeacon	Ascends to ambo, delivers first reading	Pericope from New Testament epistles ⁵	OR I:56
	Cantor, <i>schola cantorum</i>	Cantor ascends to the steps of ambo, delivers chant with <i>schola cantorum</i>	Gradual	OR I:57
	Cantor, <i>schola cantorum</i> , the faithful	Chant	<i>Alleluia</i> or tract ⁶	OR I:57
	Deacon	Kisses pope's feet	—	OR I:59
	Pope to deacon	Blesses deacon	<i>Dominus sit in corde tuo et in labiis tuis</i>	OR I:59
	Deacon	Kisses evangeliary, picks it up from altar, carries it to ambo, passes between acolytes, regionary subdeacons	—	OR I:59

⁴ *L'ordinaire*, 62, 64. This was only performed on Sundays and feast days in the presence of the bishop.

⁵ At times the first reading could be from the Old Testament or the Acts of the Apostles.

⁶ The tract could be substituted for the Alleluia during solemn or penitential liturgical seasons. If the tract was chanted instead of the Alleluia, it is unlikely that the faithful would join in.

	Attendant subdeacon to regionary subdeacon	Exchange of thurible	—	OR I:59
	Regionary subdeacons with thurible, acolytes with candles	Accompany deacon to the ambo	—	OR I:59
	Deacon, regionary subdeacon	Exchange of evangelary, determination of spot for reading	—	OR I:61
	Deacon	Places finger in correct spot for reading, ascends ambo, delivers Gospel reading	Gospel pericope	OR I:62
	Regionary deacons	Stand in front of the ambo during Gospel reading	—	OR I:62
	Pope, congregation	Dialogue after the Gospel	Dialogue after the Gospel ⁷	OR I:63
	Deacons	Descend from ambo	—	OR I:64
	Deacon to regionary deacon to attendant subdeacon	Exchange of evangelary; all kiss book	—	OR I:64
	Acolyte, regionary subdeacon	Acolyte holds container, subdeacon places evangelary in it	—	OR I:65
	Acolyte, regionary subdeacon	Return evangelary to Lateran	—	OR I:65

⁷ OR I:63: “Pax tibi. Dominus vobiscum./Et cum spiritu tuo.”

Liturgy of the Eucharist (OR I:67–126)

Section	Actor	Action	Prayer/ Chant	ORI Reference
Offertory	<i>Schola cantorum</i>	Chant	Offertory antiphon	—
	Acolyte, deacon	Acolyte carries chalice and corporal; deacon takes corporal	Offertory antiphon	OR I:67
	Deacon, second deacon	Dressing of altar with corporal	Offertory antiphon	OR I:67
	<i>Primicerius</i> of notaries, <i>secundicerius</i> , <i>primicerius</i> of <i>defensores</i> , regionaries, notaries	Ascend to pope's Chair	Offertory antiphon	OR I:68
	Subdeacon with empty chalice, archdeacon	Subdeacon follows archdeacon	Offertory antiphon	OR I:68
	Pope, <i>primicerius</i> of notaries, <i>primicerius</i> of <i>defensores</i>	Pope ascends to <i>senatorium</i> holding hands of the <i>primicerius</i> of notaries and <i>primicerius</i> of <i>defensores</i>	Offertory antiphon	OR I:69
	Pope, men in <i>senatorium</i>	Pope receives bread and wine from noble men	Offertory antiphon	OR I:69
	Archdeacon, regionary subdeacon with chalice, acolyte with <i>sciffus</i>	Archdeacon receives smaller flagons, pours content into chalice; regionary subdeacon holds chalice; full chalice emptied into <i>sciffus</i>	Offertory antiphon	OR I:70
	Pope to regionary subdeacon to attendant subdeacon to acolytes	Exchange of bread from pope to regionary subdeacon to attendant subdeacon; the last places it in cloth that acolytes hold	Offertory antiphon	OR I:71

	Bishop, acolyte with linen cloth	Bishop receives remaining bread, places it in cloth of acolyte	Offertory antiphon	OR I:72
	Archdeacon to deacon	Exchange of chalice; deacon empties contents of chalice into <i>sciffus</i>	Offertory antiphon	OR I:73
	Pope, <i>primicerius</i> of the notaries, <i>secundicerius</i> , <i>primicerius</i> of notaries	Pope travels in front of <i>confessio</i> , receives bread from <i>primicerius</i> of notaries, <i>secundicerius</i> , <i>primicerius</i> of <i>defensores</i>	Offertory antiphon	OR I:74
	Pope, women in women's section	Pope receives gifts from noble women	Offertory antiphon	OR I:75
	Pope, <i>primicerius</i> of notaries, <i>secundicerius</i>	Pope, holding the hands of the <i>primicerius</i> and <i>secundicerius</i> of notaries, returns to his Chair	Offertory antiphon	OR I:76
	Archdeacon	Washes hands	Offertory antiphon	OR I:77
	Archdeacon, pope	Archdeacon indicates to pope that altar is prepared; pope signals to archdeacon and approaches altar	Offertory antiphon	OR I:77
	Attendant subdeacon to regionary subdeacons to archdeacon	Exchange of bread	Offertory antiphon	OR I:78
	Archdeacon	Arrangement of bread, vessels on altar	Offertory antiphon	OR I:78–79
	Archdeacon, <i>oblationarius</i> subdeacon	Archdeacon takes smaller flagon of pope from <i>oblationarius</i> subdeacon, pours it with strainer into chalice; does the same with smaller flagons of deacons, <i>primicerius</i> of notaries, <i>secundicerius</i> , <i>primicerius</i> of <i>defensores</i>	Offertory antiphon	OR I:79

	Fourth of <i>schola cantorum</i> to attendant subdeacon to archdeacon	Fourth of <i>schola cantorum</i> gives ewer to attendant subdeacon; attendant subdeacon gives it to archdeacon; archdeacon, making sign of cross, pours water from it into the chalice	Offertory antiphon	OR I:80
	Deacons	Ascend to pope's Chair	Offertory antiphon	OR I:81
	<i>Primicerius</i> of notaries, <i>secundicerius</i> , <i>primicerius</i> of <i>defensores</i> , regionary notaries, regionary <i>defensores</i>	Descend from position at the Chair, stand in their places	Offertory antiphon	OR I:81
	Pope, priest, deacons	Pope gets up from Chair, descends to altar, kisses altar, receives bread from priest and deacons	Offertory antiphon	OR I:82
	<i>Oblationarius</i> subdeacon to archdeacon to pope	Exchange of bread	Offertory antiphon	OR I:83
	Regionary subdeacon to archdeacon	Exchange of chalice, placement of chalice on altar; archdeacon wraps chalice with offertory veil, places it at the corner of altar, stands behind pope	Offertory antiphon	OR I:84
	Pope	Bows to altar, signals to <i>schola cantorum</i> to stop chanting	End of offertory antiphon	OR I:85
	Pope, bishops, archdeacon, second deacon	Clergy positions themselves in correct order around altar	—	OR I:86
	Regionary subdeacon	Stands behind altar	—	OR I:87

	Pope	Prayer	<i>Oratio super oblata</i> ⁸	—
	Pope, congregation	Dialogue of preface	Preface ⁹	—
	Pope	Prayer	Preface	—
	<i>Schola cantorum</i> , the faithful	Chant	<i>Sanctus</i> ¹⁰	OR I:87
	Pope, bishops, deacons, regionary subdeacons, priests	All bow during <i>Sanctus</i>	<i>Sanctus</i>	OR I:87–88
	Pope, bishops, deacons, regionary subdeacons, priests	Pope rises to deliver prayers of Canon; rest of clergy remains bowed	—	OR I:88
Canon ¹¹	Pope	Prayer	<i>Te igitur</i> ¹²	OR I:88
	Acolyte	Takes paten with linen cloth	<i>Te igitur</i>	OR I:91
	Pope	Prayer	<i>Memento</i> ¹³	OR I:88
	Pope	Prayer	<i>Communicantes</i> ¹⁴	OR I:88
	Pope	Prayer	<i>Hanc igitur</i> ¹⁵	OR I:88
	Pope	Prayer	<i>Quam oblationem</i> ¹⁶	OR I:88
	Pope	Prayer	<i>Qui pridie</i> ¹⁷	OR I:88
	Acolyte to attendant subdeacon ¹⁸	Exchange of paten; attendant subdeacon stations himself behind altar	<i>Qui pridie</i>	OR I:92

⁸ This prayer is not mentioned in OR I, but it was already part of the Mass. *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 86 (formula 2).

⁹ The dialogue at the beginning of the preface was invariable, but not the rest of the preface. *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 86 (formula 3); *L'ordinaire*, 72, 74.

¹⁰ *L'ordinaire*, 74.

¹¹ For the Canon beginning with the *Te igitur*, see my note in Appendix 3 under OR I:88.

¹² *L'ordinaire*, 74, 76; *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 87 (formula 5). The threefold sign of the cross over the offerings is first attested in the mid-eighth century (Jungmann, *MS*, ii, 179).

¹³ *L'ordinaire*, 76; *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 87 (formula 6).

¹⁴ *L'ordinaire*, 76, 78; *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 88 (formula 7).

¹⁵ *L'ordinaire*, 78; *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 88 (formula 8).

¹⁶ *L'ordinaire*, 78; *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 88 (formula 9).

¹⁷ *L'ordinaire*, 80; *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 89 (formula 10).

¹⁸ The positioning of this exchange is approximate: OR I:91 says that it happens in the middle of the Canon; this is the point at which six of the prayers of the Canon had already been said, and six further ones remained.

	Pope	Prayer	<i>Unde et memores</i> ¹⁹	OR I:88
	Pope	Prayer	<i>Supra quae</i> ²⁰	OR I:88
	Pope	Prayer	<i>Supplices te rogamus</i> ²¹	OR I:88
	Pope	Prayer	<i>Nobis quoque</i> ²²	OR I:88–89
	Regionary subdeacons	Rise at <i>Nobis quoque</i>	<i>Nobis quoque</i>	OR I:89
	Pope	Prayer	<i>Per quem haec omnia</i> ²³	OR I:88–89
	Archdeacon	Rises at <i>Per quem haec omnia</i>	<i>Per quem haec omnia</i>	OR I:89
	Pope, archdeacon	Archdeacon lifts chalice filled with consecrated wine with offertory veil; pope lifts consecrated bread, touches side of chalice with it	<i>Per ipsum</i> ²⁴	OR I:89–90
	Pope	Places consecrated bread in its place on altar	—	OR I:90
	Archdeacon	Places chalice next to consecrated bread, removes offertory veil from handles of chalice	—	OR I:90
	Attendant subdeacon to regionary subdeacon	Exchange of paten; regionary subdeacon stands behind archdeacon	—	OR I:93
Communion	Pope	Prayer	<i>Pater noster</i> ²⁵	—
	Pope	Prayer	<i>Libera nos</i> ²⁶	OR I:94

¹⁹ *L'ordinaire*, 80, 82; *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 89 (formula 11).

²⁰ *L'ordinaire*, 82; *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 89 (formula 12).

²¹ *L'ordinaire*, 82; *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 90 (formula 13).

²² *L'ordinaire*, 84; *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 90 (formula 14).

²³ *L'ordinaire*, 84; *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 91 (formula 15).

²⁴ *L'ordinaire*, 84; *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 91 (formula 16).

²⁵ *L'ordinaire*, 86; *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 91 (formulae 17–18).

²⁶ *L'ordinaire*, 86; *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 91–92 (formula 19).

	Regionary subdeacon to archdeacon to second deacon	Exchange of paten; archdeacon kisses it before handing it to second deacon	<i>Libera nos</i>	ORI:94
	Pope	Prayer, places piece of consecrated bread into chalice (first <i>commixtio</i>)	<i>Pax domini</i> ²⁷	ORI:95
	Archdeacon, bishop, other clergy, the faithful	Kiss of Peace	—	ORI:96
	Pope, deacon	Pope breaks consecrated bread on the right side of altar, leaves a piece of consecrated bread on the altar, places rest of consecrated bread on the paten that the deacon holds	—	ORI:97
	Pope	Returns to Chair	—	ORI:98, 118
	<i>Primicerius</i> of notaries, <i>secundicerius</i> , <i>primicerius</i> of <i>defensores</i> , regionaries, notaries	Go up to altar, stand at the right and left of altar	—	ORI:98
	Archdeacon to regionary subdeacon	Exchange of chalice; regionary subdeacon holds it beside the right side of the altar	—	ORI:100
	Attendant subdeacons, acolytes with sacks, archdeacon	Acolytes offer sacks; attendant subdeacons prepare sacks to receive consecrated bread; archdeacon places consecrated bread inside	—	ORI:101

²⁷ *L'ordinaire*, 86; *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, i, 92 (formula 20).

	Acolytes	Go to right and left of bishops around the altar, depart church for titular churches; the rest go to priests, consecrated bread	—	OR I:102
	Deacon to regionary subdeacons to deacons	Transport, exchange of paten	—	OR I:103
	Deacons, other clergy, pope	Deacon and clergy look to the pope; when he signals, they signal back to pope and break consecrated bread (fraction)	—	OR I:104
	Archdeacon	Removes consecrated bread from altar, indicates to <i>schola cantorum</i> to chant <i>Agnus Dei</i> , goes to paten	—	OR I:105
	<i>Schola cantorum</i> , the faithful	Chant during fraction	<i>Agnus Dei</i> ²⁸	OR I:99, 105
	<i>Nomincolator</i> , <i>sacellarius</i> , notary of <i>vicedominus</i> , pope	<i>Nomincolator</i> , <i>sacellarius</i> , notary of <i>vicedominus</i> get names of guests for the tables of pope and <i>vicedominus</i> , descend to invite them	—	OR I:99
	Regionary subdeacon to deacon	Exchange of paten; deacon brings it to pope's Chair	—	OR I:106
	Deacon to pope	Distributes consecrated bread	—	OR I:106

²⁸ *L'ordinaire*, 88. It was not until the tenth century that in some places “dona nobis pacem” replaced the third “miserere nobis.” Jungmann, *MS*, ii, 420–22.

	Pope, archdeacon	Pope takes piece of consecrated bread he bit, places it in the chalice in the hands of the archdeacon (second <i>commixtio</i>), prayer	<i>Fiat commixtio</i> ²⁹	OR I:107
	Archdeacon to pope	Archdeacon gives consecrated wine to pope	—	OR I:107
	Archdeacon, acolyte	Archdeacon goes to corner of altar, announces where Communion is to be distributed, pours a bit of consecrated wine from the chalice into the <i>sciffus</i> held by an acolyte ³⁰	—	OR I:108
	Bishops, pope	Bishops ascend to pope's Chair, pope distributes consecrated bread to them	Blessing at distribution of Communion ³¹	OR I:108
	Pope to priests	Pope distributes consecrated bread to priests	Blessing at distribution of Communion	OR I:109
	Archdeacon to first bishop	Exchange of chalice	—	OR I:110
	First bishop to other clergy	First bishop gives other clergy the consecrated wine	—	OR I:110
	First bishop to archdeacon	Exchange of chalice	—	OR I:111
	Archdeacon	Pours consecrated wine from chalice into <i>sciffus</i>	—	OR I:111

²⁹ OR I:107: "Fiat commixtio et consecratio corporis et sanguinis domini nostri Iesu Christi accipientibus nobis in vitam aeternam. Amen."

³⁰ The last action is the *inmixtio*, by which the wine in the *sciffus* is consecrated by contact with already consecrated wine. See M. Andrieu, *Inmixtio et consecratio. La consécration par contact dans les documents liturgiques du moyen âge* (Paris, 1924).

³¹ *The Earliest Life of Gregory the Great by an Anonymous Monk of Whitby*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave (Cambridge, 1985), 106: "Corpus Domini nostri Iesu Christi conservet animam tuam."

	Archdeacon to regionary subdeacon	Exchange of chalice	—	OR I:111
	Regionary subdeacon to archdeacon	Gives liturgical straw to archdeacon	—	OR I:111
	Regionary subdeacon to attendant subdeacon to acolyte	Exchange of chalice; acolyte returns it to sacristy	—	OR I:112
	Pope, <i>primicerius</i> of notaries, <i>primicerius</i> of <i>defensores</i>	Pope, holding the hands of the <i>primicerius</i> of notaries and <i>primicerius</i> of <i>defensores</i> , descends from Chair	—	OR I:113
	Pope to noble male citizens	Distributes consecrated bread	Blessing at distribution of Communion	OR I:113
	<i>Schola cantorum</i>	Chant	Communion antiphon	OR I:117
	Archdeacon to noble male citizens	Gives consecrated wine to noble male citizens	Communion antiphon	OR I:113
	Pope, archdeacon to noble female citizens	Give consecrated bread and wine to noble female citizens	Blessing at distribution of Communion; Communion antiphon	OR I:118
	Pope	Returns to Chair	Communion antiphon	OR I:118
	Pope to <i>primicerius</i> of notaries to bishops	Indication that Communion can be distributed to people	Communion antiphon	OR I:114
	Bishops, deacons to male faithful	Bishops distribute consecrated bread to second most exalted male group of the faithful; deacons give them consecrated wine	Blessing at distribution of Communion; Communion antiphon	OR I:114

	Bishops, deacons to female faithful	Bishops distribute consecrated bread to second most exalted female group of the faithful and deacons give them consecrated wine	Blessing at distribution of Communion; Communion antiphon	OR I:115
	Pope to priests	Pope signals priests to give consecrated bread and wine to the humblest group of the faithful	Communion antiphon	OR I:116
	Priests to male and female faithful	Priests give consecrated bread and wine to the humblest group of the faithful	Blessing at distribution of Communion; Communion antiphon	OR I:116
	Regionary subdeacon to pope	Regionary subdeacon stands in front of pope and indicates to pope when people have all taken Communion	Communion antiphon	OR I:121
	Regionary subdeacon	Goes to pope's side, makes sign of the cross on his own forehead	Communion antiphon	OR I:122
	Regionary subdeacon to prior of the <i>schola cantorum</i>	Signals to prior of <i>schola cantorum</i> to chant <i>Gloria patri</i>	Communion antiphon	OR I:122
	Prior of <i>schola cantorum</i> , <i>schola cantorum</i>	Prior of <i>schola</i> gestures back to regionary subdeacon; <i>schola cantorum</i> chants <i>Gloria patri</i>	<i>Gloria patri</i> , end of Communion antiphon	OR I:117, 122
	Pope to regionaries, others, twelve members of <i>schola cantorum</i>	Pope distributes consecrated bread to regionaries, certain others, members of <i>schola cantorum</i>	Blessing at distribution of Communion	OR I:118
	Archdeacon to regionaries, others, 12 members of <i>schola cantorum</i>	Archdeacon gives consecrated wine to regionaries, others, 12 members of <i>schola cantorum</i>	—	OR I:120

	<i>Nomincolator</i> , <i>sacellarius</i> , acolytes, pope	<i>Nomincolator</i> , <i>sacellarius</i> , acolytes return from duties; pope distributes consecrated bread to them	Blessing at distribution of Communion	OR I:119
	Archdeacon to <i>nomincolator</i> , <i>sacellarius</i> , acolytes	Archdeacon gives consecrated wine to <i>nomincolator</i> , <i>sacellarius</i> , acolytes	—	OR I:120
	Pope, archdeacon	Pope and archdeacon go to altar; pope delivers prayer	Final prayer	OR I:123
Conclusion of the Mass	Pope to deacon appointed by the archdeacon	Pope indicates to deacon to deliver dismissal	—	OR I:124
	Deacon, congregation	Deacon delivers dismissal; congregation responds	<i>Ite missa est</i> ³²	OR I:124
	Acolytes with candles, regionary subdeacon with thurible	Recess into <i>secretarium</i> in front of pope	—	OR I:125
	Bishops, priests, monks, <i>schola cantorum</i> , <i>draconarius</i> soldiers, porters, candle-bearers, acolytes who watch over the gate, cross- bearers, junior sextons	Groups individually request blessing from pope; pope blesses each group	<i>Iube, domine</i> ³³	OR I:126
	Bishops, priests, monks, <i>schola cantorum</i> , <i>draconarius</i> soldiers, porters, candle- bearers, acolytes who watch over the gate, cross-bearers, junior sextons	Recess into the <i>secretarium</i> after the pope	—	OR I:126

³² *L'ordinaire*, 90; OR I:124: “Ite, Missa est./Deo gratias.”

³³ OR I:126: “Iube, domne, benedicere./Benedicat nos dominus. Amen.”

This page has been left blank intentionally

Select Bibliography

NB: This bibliography is intended to collect the primary and secondary works that have proved most useful for my study rather than to be comprehensive.

Primary Sources

- Amalar of Metz, *Amalarii episcopi opera liturgica omnia*, ed. J.M. Hanssens, *Studi e testi*, 138–40 (Vatican City: Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, 1948–1950)
- Anastasii Sinaitae Quaestiones et responsiones*, ed. Marcel Richard and Joseph A. Munitiz, *Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca*, 59 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006)
- Anastasius II of Antioch, *Oratio de sacra synaxi*, *PG*, lxxxix, 825–49
- Antiphonale missarum sextuplex*, ed. René-Jean Hesbert (Brussels: Vromant, 1935)
- Arator, *Historia apostolica*, ed. A. P. Orbán, *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina*, 130, 130A (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006)
- Boniface, *Die Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, ed. Michael Tangl, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae selectae*, 1 (2nd edn, Berlin: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1955)
- The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, AD 284–813*, trans. and commentary Cyril Mango and Roger Scott (Oxford: Clarendon Press/New York: Oxford University Press, 1997)
- Concilium Lateranense anno 649 celebratum*, ed. Rudolf Riedinger, in *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum, Series secunda*, 1 (Berlin: W. De Gruyter, 1984)
- Constantinople III, in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. Norman P. Tanner, 2 vols (London: Sheed & Ward/Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990), vol. 1: 124–30
- Council of 601, *PL*, lxxvii, 1340D–1343D
- Council of 721, *PL*, lxxvii, 341–6
- Council of 743, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Legum Sectio III, Concilia aevi Karolini*, ed. Albert Werminghoff (Hanover, 1906–1908), vol. 1: 8–32
- Council of 745, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Legum Sectio III, Concilia aevi Karolini*, ed. Albert Werminghoff (Hanover, 1906–1908), vol. 1: 37–44

- The Earliest Life of Gregory the Great by an Anonymous Monk of Whitby*, ed. and trans. Bertram Colgrave (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985)
- “Un épitomé inédit de la vie de S. Jean l’Aumônier,” ed. Eurydice Lappa-Zizicas, *Analecta Bollandiana*, 88 (1970): 265–78
- L’Eucologio Barberini Gr. 336*, ed. Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, 2nd edn (Rome: C. L. V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000)
- Fragmenta Picta. Affreschi e mosaici staccati del Medioevo romano*, ed. Maria Andaloro, Alessandra Ghidoli, Antonio Iacobini, Serena Romano, and Alessandro Tomei (Rome: Àrgos, 1989)
- Gestorum pontificum Romanorum volumen I. Libri pontificalis pars prior*, ed. Theodor Mommsen (Berlin: Weidmannos, 1898)
- Gregory I, *Dialogi*, ed. Adalbert de Vogüé, trans. Paul Antin, Sources chrétiennes, 251, 260, 265 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1978–1980)
- *Expositio in Canticum canticorum*, ed. Patrick Verbraken, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 144 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1963)
- *Homiliae in Evangelia*, ed. Raymond Etaix, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 141 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999)
- *Homiliae in Hiezechielem prophetam*, ed. Marcus Adriaen, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 142 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1971)
- *Moralia in Job*, ed. Marcus Adriaen, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 143, 143A, 143B (Turnhout: Brepols, 1979–1985)
- *Registrum*, ed. Dag Norberg, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 140–140A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1982)
- *Regula pastoralis*, ed. Floribert Rommel, trans. Charles Morel, Sources chrétiennes, 381–2 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1992)
- Ihm, Christa, *Die Programme der christlichen Apsismalerei: Vom 4. Jahrhundert bis zur Mitte des 8. Jahrhunderts* (2nd edn, Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1992)
- Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, ed. Christopher M. Lawson, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 113 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1989)
- *Etymologiae*, ed. W.M. Lindsay (2 vols, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911)
- Itineraria et alia geographica*, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 175–6 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1965)
- John Moschos, *Leimōn (Spiritual Meadow)*, PG, lxxxvii, 2851–3116
- Krautheimer, Richard, *Corpus basilicarum christianorum Romae* (5 vols, Vatican City: Pontificio Istituto di archeologia cristiana, 1937–1977)
- Leontios of Neapolis, *Vie de Syméon le Fou; Vie de Jean de Chypre*, ed. A.J. Festugière, Bibliothèque archéologique et historique, 95 (Paris: P. Geuthner, 1974)
- Liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum*, ed. Hans Foerster (Bern: Francke Verlag, 1958)
- Liber pontificalis*, ed. Louis Duchesne (3 vols, Paris: E. de Boccard, 1981)

- Liber sacramentorum Romanae Aeclesiae ordinis anni circuli*, (Cod. Vat. Reg. lat. 316/Paris Bibl. Nat. 7193, 41/56) (*Sacramentarium Gelasianum*), in Verbindung mit Leo Eizenhöfer und Petrus Siffrin, ed. Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, 3rd edn, *Rerum ecclesiasticarum documenta*, Series maior, Fontes, 4 (Rome: Herder, 1981)
- “Liturgie et basiliques de Rome au milieu du VII^e siècle d’après les listes d’Evangiles de Wurzburg,” ed. Germain Morin, *Revue bénédictine*, 28 (1911): 296–330
- Liturgies, Eastern and Western, Being the Texts Original or Translated, of the Principal Liturgies of the Church*, ed. F.E. Brightman (Oxford/New York: Clarendon Press, 1896)
- Maximus the Confessor and his Companions: Documents from Exile*, ed. and trans. Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Maximus the Confessor, *La Mystagogie de saint Maxime le Confesseur*, ed. and trans. Charalampos Sotiropoulos (Athens, 2001)
- Miracles of St. Artemios: A Collection of Miracle Stories by an Anonymous Author of Seventh Century Byzantium*, ed. and trans. Virgil S. Crisafulli and John W. Nesbitt, *The Medieval Mediterranean*, 13 (Leiden/New York: E.J. Brill, 1997)
- L’ordinaire de la messe: texte critique, traduction et études*, ed. and trans. Bernard Botte and Christine Mohrmann (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1953)
- Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen âge*, ed. Michel Andrieu, *Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense*, Etudes et documents, 11, 23, 24, 28, 29 (5 vols, Louvain, 1931–1961)
- Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, ed. Ludwig Konrad Bethmann and Georg Waitz, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, *Scriptores Rerum Langobardicarum* (Hanover, 1878)
- La pittura medievale a Roma, 312–1431: Corpus e atlante*, ed. Maria Andaloro and Serena Romano (5 projected vols, Milan: Jaca Book/Turnhout: Brepols, 2006–)
- “Le plus ancien ‘Comes’ ou lectionnaire de l’Eglise romaine,” ed. Germain Morin, *Revue bénédictine*, 27 (1910): 41–74
- Das römische Capitulare evangeliorum*, ed. Theodor Klauser, *Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen und Forschungen*, 28 (Münster/Westphalia: Aschendorff, 1935)
- Le sacramentaire grégorien: Ses principales formes d’après les plus anciens manuscrits*, ed. Jean Deshusses, *Spicilegium Friburgense*, 16, 24, 28 (Fribourg: Editions universitaires Fribourg, 1971, 1979, 1982)
- Saint Anastase le Perse: et l’histoire de la Palestine au début du VII^e siècle*, ed. Bernard Flusin (2 vols, Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1992)

- Seventh-century Popes and Martyrs: The Political Hagiography of Anastasius Bibliothecarius*, ed. and trans. Bronwen Neil (Turnhout: Brepols/NSW, Australia: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 2006)
- Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia*, ed. Carl de Boor, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1883)
- “Une vie inédite de Saint Jean l’Aumônier,” ed. Hippolyte Delehaye, *Analecta Bollandiana*, 45 (1927): 5–74
- Vie de Théodore de Sykéôn*, ed. A.J. Festugière (2 vols, Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1970).
- Vitas sanctorum patrum Emeretensium*, ed. A. Maya Sánchez, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 116 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1992)

Secondary Sources

- Alföldi, Andreas, *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970)
- Althoff, Gerd, *Die Macht der Rituale: Symbolik und Herrschaft im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 2003)
- Andrieu, Michel, *Inmixtio et consecratio. La consécration par contact dans les documents liturgiques du moyen âge* (Paris: A. Picard, 1924)
- “Les messes des jeudis de Carême et les anciens sacramentaires,” *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 9 (1929): 343–75
- “Les ordres mineurs dans l’ancien rit romain,” *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 5 (1925): 232–74
- Angenendt, Arnold, *Das Frühmittelalter: die abendländische Christenheit von 400 bis 900* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1990)
- *Geschichte der Religiosität im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 1997)
- *Liturgie im Mittelalter: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Thomas Flammer and Daniel Meyer (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2004)
- “Missa specialis. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Entstehung der Privatmesse,” *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 17 (1983): 153–221
- “Das Offertorium: In liturgischer Praxis und symbolischer Kommunikation,” in *Zeichen – Rituale – Werte: Internationales Kolloquium des Sonderforschungsbereichs 496 an der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität Münster*, ed. Gerd Althoff and Christiane Witthöft (Münster: Rhema, 2004): 71–150
- “Rex et sacerdos: zur Genese der Königssalbung,” in *Tradition als historische Kraft: Interdisziplinäre Forschungen zur Geschichte des früheren Mittelalters*, ed. Norbert Kamp and Joachim Wollasch (Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1982): 100–18
- Apel, Willi, *Gregorian Chant* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1958)

- Arbusow, Leonid, *Liturgie und Geschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter* (Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag, 1951)
- Arnold, John H., *Belief and Unbelief in Medieval Europe* (London/New York: Hodder Arnold, 2005)
- Arquillière, Henri Xavier, *L'augustinisme politique; essai sur la formation des théories politiques du Moyen-Age* (2nd edn, Paris: J. Vrin, 1955)
- Ashworth, Henry, "The Influence of the Lombard Invasions on the Gregorian Sacramentary," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 36 (1953–1954): 305–27
- Atchley, Edward Godfrey Cuthbert Frederic, *Ordo Romanus Primus* (London: Alexander Moring, 1905)
- Atti del colloquio internazionale: Arredi di culto e disposizioni liturgiche a Roma da Costantino a Sisto IV* (Istituto Olandese a Roma, 3–4 dicembre 1999), *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome, Historical Studies*, 59 (2000) (Rome: Koninklijke van Gorcum, 2001)
- Atti del colloquio internazionale: Il Liber Pontificalis e la storia materiale. Roma, 21–22 febbraio 2002*, ed. Herman Geertman, in *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome*, 60–61 (2001–2002)
- Baldovin, John F., "The Fermentum at Rome in the Fifth Century: A Reconsideration," *Worship*, 79 (2005): 38–53
- "Kyrie Eleison and the Entrance Rite of the Roman Eucharist," *Worship*, 60 (1986): 334–47
- *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stational Liturgy*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 228 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1987)
- Batiffol, Pierre, *Leçons sur la messe* (4th edn, Paris: J. Gabalda, 1919)
- Bauer, Franz Alto, *Das Bild der Stadt Rom im Frühmittelalter: Papststiftungen im Spiegel des Liber Pontificalis von Gregor dem Dritten bis zu Leo dem Dritten* (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2004)
- "La frammentazione liturgica nella chiesa romana del primo medioevo," *Rivista di archeologia cristiana*, 75 (1999): 385–446
- Bell, Catherine, *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997)
- *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992)
- Bertolini, Ottorino, "Per la storia delle diaconie romane nell'alto medioevo sino alla fine del secolo VIII," in *Scritti scelti di storia medioevale*, ed. Ottavio Banti (Livorno: Società Editrice "Il Telegrafo," 1968): 309–460
- Bishop, Edmund, *Liturgica Historica: Papers on the Liturgy and Religious Life of the Western Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1918)
- Blaauw, Sible de, "Contrasts in Processional Liturgy: A Typology of Outdoor Processions in Twelfth-Century Rome," in *Art, cérémonial et liturgie au moyen âge. Actes du colloque de 3^e Cycle Romand de Lettres Lausanne-Fribourg, 24–25 mars, 14–15 avril, 12–13 mai 2000* (Rome: Viella, 2002): 357–94

- *Cultus et decor: Liturgia e architettura nella Roma tardoantica e medievale*, Studi e Testi, 355–6 (2 vols, Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1994)
- “Following the Crosses: The Processional Cross and the Typology of Processions in Medieval Rome,” *Christian Feast and Festival: The Dynamics of Western Liturgy and Culture*, ed. P. Post, G. Rouwhorst, L. van Tongeren and A. Scheer (Leuven: Peeters, 2001): 319–43
- “Het ideaal van de stad als kerk. Verval en herleving van de Romeinse statieliturgie,” in *Bouwkunst. Studies in vriendschap voor Kees Peeters* (Amsterdam: Architectura & Natura Press, 1993): 77–86
- “Imperial Connotations in Roman Church Interiors: The Significance and Effect of the Lateran *Fastigium*,” *Acta ad Archaeologiam et Artium Historiam pertinentia*, 15/N.S. 1 (2001): 137–46
- *Men het oog op het licht: Een vergeten principe in de oriëntatie van het vroegchristelijk kerkgebouw* (Nijmegen: Nijmegen University Press, 2000)
- Blaise, Albert, *Le vocabulaire latin des principaux thèmes liturgiques* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1966)
- Bossy, John, “The Mass as a Social Institution, 1200–1700,” *Past & Present*, 100 (1983): 29–61
- Bouley, Allan, *From Freedom to Formula: The Evolution of the Eucharistic Prayer from Oral Improvisation to Written Texts*, Studies in Christian Antiquity, 21 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1981)
- Bourguignon, Erika, *Religion, Altered States of Consciousness, and Social Change* (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1973)
- Bowes, Kim, *Private Worship, Public Values, and Religious Change in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008)
- Boynton, Susan, *Shaping a Monastic Identity: Liturgy & History at the Imperial Abbey of Farfa, 1000–1125* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006)
- Bradshaw, Paul F., *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy* (2nd edn, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Braun, Josef, *Der christliche Altar in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (2 vols, Munich: Alte Meister Guenther Koch & Co, 1924)
- *Die liturgische Gewandung im Occident und Orient: nach Ursprung und Entwicklung, Verwendung und Symbolik* (Freiburg im Breisgau/St. Louis, MO: Herder, 1907)
- Brittain, Fred, *Latin in Church: Episodes in the History of its Pronunciation, Particularly in England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934)
- Brock, Sebastian, “The Thrice-Holy Hymn in the Liturgy,” *Sobornost*, 7 (1985): 24–34
- Browe, Peter, *Die Eucharistie im Mittelalter: Liturgiehistorische Forschungen in kulturwissenschaftlicher Absicht* (Münster: Lit, 2003)

- Brown, T.S., *Gentlemen and Officers: Imperial Administration and Aristocratic Power in Byzantine Italy A.D. 554–800* (London: British School at Rome, 1984)
- Buc, Philippe. *The Dangers of Ritual: Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001)
- Burke, Peter, "Sacred Rulers, Royal Priests: Rituals of the Early Modern Popes," in *The Historical Anthropology of Early Modern Italy: Essays on Perception and Communication* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987): 168–82
- Bury, J.B. *History of the Later Roman Empire* (2 vols, Chicago: Ares Publishers, 1974 [1923])
- Büsse, Helmut, "Salus" in der römischen Liturgie: ein Beitrag zur Sprache und Theologie liturgischer Gebetstexte (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1960)
- Callam, Daniel, "The Frequency of Mass in the Latin Church ca. 400," *Theological Studies*, 45 (1984): 613–50
- Capelle, Bernard, "Collecta," *Revue bénédictine*, 42 (1930): 197–204
- Carpegna Falconieri, Tommaso di, *Il clero di Roma nel medioevo: Istituzioni e politica cittadina (secoli VIII–XIII)* (Rome: Viella, 2002)
- Caseau, Béatrice, "L'abandon de la communion dans la main (IVe–XIIe siècles)," in *Mélanges Gilbert Dagron*, ed. Gilbert Dagron and Vincent Déroche (Paris: Associations des amis du Centre d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, 2002): 79–94
- Caspar, Erich, *Geschichte des Papsttums* (2 vols, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1930 & 1933)
- Chavasse, Antoine, *La liturgie de la ville de Rome du V^e au VIII^e siècle. Une liturgie conditionnée par l'organisation de la vie in Urbe et Extra Muros* (Rome: Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 1993)
- "Messas du pape Vigile (537–555) dans le sacramentaire léonien," *Ephemerides liturgicae*, 64 (1950), 161–213 & 66 (1952): 145–219
- "L'organisation stationale du Carême romain, avant le VIII^e siècle: Une organisation 'pastorale,'" *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 56 (1982): 17–32
- "Le Sermonaire vaticane du VII^e siècle," *Sacriserudiri*, 23 (1978–1979): 225–89
- The Church at Prayer: An Introduction to the Liturgy*, ed. Aimé-Georges Martimort et al., trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (3 vols, Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1987)
- Coates-Stephens, Robert, "Dark Age Architecture in Rome," *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 65 (1997): 177–232
- Collins, Mary, "Evangelization, Catechesis, and the Beginnings of Western Eucharistic Theology," *Louvain Studies*, 23 (1998): 124–42
- Collins, Robert, *Keepers of the Keys of Heaven: A History of the Papacy* (New York: Basic Books, 2000)

- Congar, Yves, *L'ecclésiologie du haut Moyen âge: De saint Grégoire le Grand à la désunion entre Byzance et Rome* (Paris: Editions de Cerf, 1968)
- Conte, Pietro, *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei papi del secolo VII* (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1971)
- *Regesto delle lettere dei papi del secolo VIII* (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1984)
- *Il sinodo lateranense dell'ottobre 649. La nuova edizione degli atti a cura di Rudolf Riedinger. Rassegna critica di fonti dei secoli VII–XII* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1989)
- The Council in Trullo Revisited*, ed. George Nedungatt and Michael Featherstone (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1995)
- Croce, Walter, "Die niederen Weihen und ihre hierarchische Wertung: Eine geschichtliche Studie," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 70 (1948): 257–314
- Crocker, Richard L., *An Introduction to Gregorian Chant* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000)
- Dagron, Gilbert, *Emperor and Priest: The Imperial Office in Byzantium*, trans. Jean Birrell (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003)
- Dalmais, Irénée-Henri, "Mystère liturgique et divinisation dans la Mystagogia de saint Maxime le Confesseur," in *Epektasis, Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*, ed. Jacques Fontaine and Charles Kannanengiesser (Paris: Beauchesne, 1972): 55–62.
- De Benedictis, Elaine, "The 'Schola Cantorum' in Rome during the High Middle Ages" (PhD thesis, Bryn Mawr College, 1983)
- "The Senatorium and Matroneum in the Early Roman Church," *Rivista di archeologia cristiana*, 57 (1981): 69–85
- De Clerck, Paul, "L'immagine dei nemici nelle antiche orazioni romane," in *I nemici della cristianità*, ed. Giuseppe Ruggieri (Bologna: Società editrice il Mulino, 1997): 59–81
- *La prière universelle dans les liturgies latines anciennes: témoignages patristiques et textes liturgiques* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1977)
- De Jong, J.P., "L'arrière-plan dogmatique du rite de la commixtion dans la messe romaine," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 3 (1953): 78–97
- "Le rite de la commixtion dans la messe romaine, dans ses rapports avec les liturgies syriennes," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 4 (1956): 245–78 & 5 (1957): 33–77
- Delogu, Paolo, "*Solium imperii – urbs ecclesiae*: Roma fra la tarda antichità e l'alto medioevo," in *Sedes regiae (ann. 400–800)*, ed. Gisela Ripoli and Josep M. Gurt (Barcelona: Reial Acadèmia de Bones Lletres, 2000): 83–108
- Driscoll, Michael S. and Susan Guise Sheridan, "Every Knee Shall Bend: A Biocultural Reconstruction of Liturgical and Ascetical Prayer in V–VII Century Palestine," *Worship*, 74 (2000): 453–68

- Duchesne, Louis, *Origines du culte chrétien. Etude sur la liturgie latine avant Charlemagne* (5th edn, Paris: Anciennes Maisons Thorin et Fontemoing, 1925 [1889])
- “Les régions de Rome au moyen-âge,” *Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire de l’Ecole française de Rome*, 10 (1890): 126–49
- Duffy, Eamon, *Saints & Sinners: A History of the Popes* (3rd edn, New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2006)
- *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c.1400–c.1580* (2nd edn, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005)
- Dyer, Joseph, “The Roman Offertory: An Introduction and Some Hypotheses,” in *The Offertory and its Verses: Research, Past, Present and Future*, ed. Roman Hankeln (Trondheim, Norway: Tapir Academic Press, 2007): 15–40
- “The Offertory Chant of the Roman Liturgy and its Musical Form,” *Studi musicali*, 11 (1982): 3–30
- “*Psalmi ante sacrificium* and the Origin of the Introit,” *Plainsong and Medieval Music*, 20 (2011): 91–121
- “The Schola Cantorum and its Roman Milieu in the Early Middle Ages,” in *De Musica et Cantu: Studien zur Geschichte der Kirchenmusik und der Oper. Helmut Huckle zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Peter Cahn and Ann-Katrin Heimer (Hildesheim/New York: G. Olms, 1993): 19–40
- Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West: Essays in Honour of Donald A. Bullough*, ed. Julia M.H. Smith (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2000)
- Ecclesiae Urbis – Atti del Convegno internazionale di Studi sulle chiese di Roma (IV–X secolo)*, ed. Federico Guidobaldi and Alessandra Guiglia Guidobaldi (3 vols, Vatican City: Pontificio Istituto di archeologia cristiana, 2002)
- L’Eglise en prière: Introduction à la liturgie*, ed. Aimé-Georges Martimort et al. (Paris: Desclée, 1961)
- Ellebracht, Mary Pierre, *Remarks on the Vocabulary of the Ancient Orations in the Missale Romanum* (Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1963)
- Erdmann, Carl, “Der Heidenkrieg in der Liturgie und die Kaiserkrönung Ottos I,” *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung*, 46 (1932): 129–42
- Fassler, Margot Elsbeth, *The Virgin of Chartres: Making History through Liturgy and the Arts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010)
- Fernandez, James W., “Symbolic Consensus in a Fang Reformativ Cult,” *American Anthropologist*, N.S. 67 (1965): 902–29
- Filotas, Bernadette, *Pagan Survivals, Superstitions and Popular Cultures in Early Medieval Pastoral Literature* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2005)
- Fischer, Balthasar, “Der niedere Klerus bei Gregor dem Grossen,” *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 62 (1938): 37–75

- Foley, Edward, *From Age to Age: How Christians Have Celebrated the Eucharist* (revised edn, Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008)
- Fortescue, Adrian, *The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy* (London/New York: Longmans, Green, 1950)
- Franklin, Carmela Virillo, *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian: Hagiographic Translations and Transformations*, Studies and Texts, 147 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2004)
- Franz, Adolph, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Liturgie und des religiösen Volkslebens* (Bonn: Nova & Vetera, 2003 [1902])
- Froger, Jacques, "L'Alleluja dans l'usage romain," *Ephemerides liturgicae*, 62 (1948): 6–48
- Galvaris, George, *Bread and the Liturgy: The Symbolism of Early Christian and Byzantine Bread Stamps* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970)
- Geertman, Herman, "La genesi del *Liber pontificalis* romano: Un processo di organizzazione della memoria," in *Liber, gesta, histoire: écrire l'histoire des évêques et des papes, de l'antiquité au XXI^e siècle*, ed. François Bougard and Michel Sot (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009): 37–107
- *Hic Fecit Basilicam. Studi sul Liber pontificalis e gli edifici ecclesiastici di Roma da Silvestro a Silverio*, ed. Sible de Blaauw and Christina E. van der Laan (Leuven/Paris/Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2004)
- *More veterum: Il Liber Pontificalis e gli edifici ecclesiastici di Roma nella tarda antichità e nell'alto medioevo* (Groningen: H.D. Tjeenk Willink, 1975)
- Geertz, Clifford, *Negara: The Theatre State in Nineteenth-Century Bali* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980)
- Gibaut, John St H., *The Cursus Honorum: A Study of the Origins and Evolution of Sequential Ordination* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000)
- Gluckman, Max, *Politics, Law and Ritual in Tribal Society* (Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co., 1965)
- Gorman, Frank H., *The Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time and Status in the Priestly Theology* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990)
- Grant, Gerard G., "The Elevation of the Host: A Reaction to Twelfth Century Heresy," *Theological Studies*, 1 (1940): 228–50
- Grégoire le grand: *Chantilly, Centre culturel Les Fontaines, 15–19 septembre 1982*, ed. Jacques Fontaine, Robert Gillet, and Stan Pellistrandi (Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1986)
- Grisar, Hartmann, *Das Missale im Lichte römischer Stadtgeschichte: Stationen, Perikopen, Gebräuche* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1925)
- Gussone, Nikolaus, *Thron und Inthronisation des Papstes von den Anfängen bis zum 12. Jahrhundert: zur Beziehung zwischen Herrschaftszeichen und bildhaften Begriffen, Recht und Liturgie im christlichen Verständnis von Wort und Wirklichkeit*, Bonner historische Forschungen, 41 (Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1978)

- Gy, Pierre-Marie, *La liturgie dans l'histoire* (Paris: Editions Saint-Paul & Editions du Cerf, 1990)
- Hack, Achim Thomas, "Bildaussendung und Bildeinholung im 7. und 8. Jahrhundert," *Saeculum*, 54 (2003): 147–78
- Haldon, John F., *Byzantium in the Seventh Century: The Transformation of a Culture* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990)
- Hamilton, Sarah, *The Practice of Penance, 900–1050* (Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2001)
- Hardison, O.B., *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages: Essays in the Origin and Early History of Modern Drama* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1965)
- Harper, John, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century: A Historical Introduction and Guide for Students and Musicians* (Oxford: Clarendon Press/New York: Oxford University Press, 1991)
- Häussling, Angelus Albert, *Mönchskonvent und Eucharistiefeyer. Eine Studie über die Messe in der abendländischen Klosterliturgie des frühen Mittelalters und zur Geschichte der Messhäufigkeit*, Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen, 58 (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1973)
- Hein, Kenneth, *Eucharist and Excommunication: A Study in Early Christian Doctrine and Discipline* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1973)
- Hen, Yitzhak, "The Romanization of the Frankish Liturgy: Ideal, Reality, and the Rhetoric of Reform," in *Rome across Time and Space: Cultural Transmission and the Exchange of Ideas c.500–1400*, ed. Claudia Bolgia, Rosamond McKitterick, and John Osborne (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011): 111–23
- Hermes, Raimund, "Die stadtrömischen Diakonien," *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte*, 91 (1996): 1–120
- Herrin, Judith, *The Formation of Christendom* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989)
- Herz, Martin Florian, *Sacrum commercium: eine begriffsgeschichtliche Studie zur Theologie der römischen Liturgiesprache* (Munich: K. Zink, 1958)
- Hesbert, René-Jean, "Le graudel, chant responsorial," *Ephemerides liturgicae*, 95 (1981): 316–50
- Higgins, Martin, "Note on the Purification (and Date of Nativity) in Constantinople in 602," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 2 (1952): 81–3.
- Hiley, David, *Gregorian Chant* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009)
- *Western Plainchant: A Handbook* (Oxford: Clarendon Press/New York: Oxford University Press, 1993)
- A History of Prayer: The First to the Fifteenth Century*, ed. Roy Hammerling (Leiden/ Boston: Brill, 2008)

- Hughes, Andrew, *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office: A Guide to their Organization and Terminology* (Toronto/Buffalo, NY: University of Toronto Press, 1982)
- Huglo, Michel, "Le répons-graduel de la messe: Evolution de la forme, permanence de la fonction," *Schweizer Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft*, N.S. 2 (1982): 53–73. Reprinted in Michel Huglo, *Chant grégorien et musique médiévale* (Aldershot/Burlington, VT: Ashgate/Variorum, 2005), no. III
- Iogna-Prat, Dominique, *Order & Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam, 1000–1150*, trans. G.R. Edwards (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002)
- Jay, Nancy, *Throughout your Generations Forever: Sacrifice, Religion, and Paternity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992)
- Jerg, Ernst, "Die 'Sustentatio' in der römischen Liturgie vor dem Hintergrund des kaiserlichen Hofzeremoniells," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 80 (1958): 316–24
- Jessop, Lesley, "Pictorial Cycles of Non-Biblical Saints: The Seventh- and Eighth-Century Mural Cycles in Rome and Contexts for their Use," *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 67 (1999), 233–79
- Jobert, Philippe, *La notion de donation: convergences, 630–750* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1977)
- Jones, A.H.M., *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602: A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey* (3 vols, Oxford: Blackwell, 1964)
- Jungmann, Josef Andreas, "Die Abwehr des germanischen Arianismus und der Umbruch der religiösen Kultur im frühen Mittelalter," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 69 (1947): 36–99
- "Fermentum: A Symbol of Church Unity and its Observance in the Middle Ages," in *Pastoral Liturgy* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1962): 287–95
- "Flectere pro Carolo rege," in *Mélanges en l'honneur de Monseigneur Michel Andrieu* (Strasbourg: Palais Universitaire, 1956): 219–28
- *Missarum sollemnia: Eine genetische Erklärung der römischen Messe* (5th edn, 2 vols, Vienna: Herder, 1962)
- Jussen, Bernhard, "Liturgie und Legitimation, oder: wie die Gallo-Romanen das römische Reich beendeten," in *Institutionen und Ereignis. Über historische Praktiken und Vorstellungen gesellschaftlichen Ordens*, ed. Reinhard Blänker and Bernhard Jussen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998): 75–136
- Kantorowicz, Ernst H., *Laudes Regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Mediaeval Ruler Worship* (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1946)
- Kazhdan, Alexander P. and Michael McCormick, "The Social World of the Byzantine Court," in *Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204*, ed. Henry Maguire (Washington, DC: Harvard University Press, 1997): 167–97

- Kelly, Henry Ansgar, *The Devil at Baptism: Ritual, Theology, and Drama* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985)
- Kennedy, Vincent Lorne, *The Saints of the Canon of the Mass* (2nd edn, Vatican City: Pontificio Istituto di archeologia cristiana, 1963)
- Kertzer, David I., *Ritual, Politics, and Power* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988)
- Kilmartin, Edward J., "Sacrificium Laudis: Content and Function of Early Eucharistic Prayers," *Theological Studies*, 35 (1974): 268–87
- Klauser, Theodor, *A Short History of the Western Liturgy: An Account and Some Reflections*, trans. John Halliburton (London: Oxford University Press, 1969)
- "Der Ursprung der bischöflichen Insignien und Ehrenrechte," *Bonner Akademische Reden*, 1 (1948): 5–44
- Koziol, Geoffrey, *Begging Pardon and Favor: Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca, NY/London: Cornell University Press, 1992)
- Krautheimer, Richard, *Rome: Profile of a City, 312–1308*, foreword by Marvin Trachtenberg (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000 [1980])
- Kuttner, Stephan, "Cardinalis: The History of a Canonical Concept," *Traditio*, 3 (1945): 129–214. Reprinted in Stephan Kuttner, *The History of Ideas and Doctrine of Canon Law in the Middle Ages* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1980), no. X
- Lanciani, Rodolfo, *Forma Urbis Romae* (Rome: Quasar, 1990 [1893–1901])
- The Languages of Gift in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010)
- Larchet, Jean-Claude, *La divinisation de l'homme selon saint Maxime le Confesseur* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1996)
- *Saint Maxime le Confesseur (580–662)* (Paris: Cerf, 2003)
- Larson-Miller, Lizette, *Medieval Liturgy: A Book of Essays* (New York/London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997)
- Latham, Jacob, "The Making of a Papal Rome: Gregory I and the *letania septiformis*," in *The Power of Religion in Late Antiquity*, ed. Andrew Cain and Noel Lenski (Farnham, Surrey/Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009): 293–304
- Le Goff, Jacques, "Le rituel symbolique de la vassalité," in *Simboli e Simbologia nell'alto Medioevo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, 23 (2 vols, Spoleto: Presso la sede del Centro, 1976), vol. 2: 679–788. Reprinted in Jacques Le Goff, *Pour un autre Moyen Age: temps, travail et culture en Occident: 18 essais* (Paris: Gallimard, 1977), 349–420
- Linder, Amnon, *Raising Arms: Liturgy in the Struggle to Liberate Jerusalem in the Late Middle Ages* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003)
- Liturgie und Gesellschaft*, ed. Hans Bernhard Meyer (Innsbruck/Vienna/Munich: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1970)
- The Liturgy of the Medieval Church*, ed. Thomas J. Heffernan and E. Ann Matter (2nd edn, Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2005)

- Liver, Ricarda, *Die Nachwirkung der antiken Sakralsprache des lateinischen und italienischen Mittelalters: Untersuchungen zu den syntaktischen und stilistischen Formen dichterisch gestalteter Gebete von den Anfängen der lateinischen Literatur bis zur Dante* (Bern: Francke, 1979)
- Llewellyn, Peter, *Rome in the Dark Ages* (London: Faber, 1971)
- The Long Morning of Medieval Europe: New Directions in Early Medieval Studies*, ed. Jennifer R. Davis and Michael McCormick (Aldershot/Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008)
- Löw, G., "Il più antico sermonario di San Pietro in Vaticano," *Rivista di archeologia cristiana*, 19 (1942): 143–84
- Macy, Gary, *The Hidden History of Women's Ordination: Female Clergy in the Medieval West* (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2008)
- Markus, Robert Austin, *Gregory the Great and his World* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
- Martimort, Aimé-Georges, "A propos du nombre des lectures à la messe," *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 58 (1984): 42–51
- *Les diaconesses: Essai historique* (Rome: C.L.V. Edizioni Liturgiche, 1982)
- *Les "Ordines," les ordinaires et les cérémoniaux*, Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental, 56 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1991)
- "Origine et signification de l'alléluia de la messe romaine," in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, ed. Patrick Granfield and Josef A. Jungmann (2 vols, Münster/Westfalen: Aschendorff, 1970), vol. 2: 811–34.
- Martínez Pizarro, Joaquín, *A Rhetoric of the Scene: Dramatic Narrative in the Early Middle Ages* (Toronto/Buffalo, NY: University of Toronto Press, 1989)
- Martyn, John R.C., "Four Notes on the Registrum of Gregory the Great," *Parergon*, N.S. 19 (2002): 5–38
- Mathews, Thomas F., *The Clash of Gods: A Reinterpretation of Early Christian Art* (revised edn, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999)
- *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1971)
- "An Early Roman Chancel Arrangement and its Liturgical Functions," *Rivista di archeologia cristiana*, 38 (1962): 73–95
- McCall, Richard D., *Do This: Liturgy as Performance* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007)
- McCormick, Michael, "Byzantium and the West, 700–900," in *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Volume 2, c.700–c.900*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995): 349–80.
- "Clovis at Tours. Byzantine Public Ritual and the Origins of Medieval Ruler Symbolism," in *Das Reich und die Barbaren*, ed. Evangelos K. Chrysos and Andreas Schwarz (Vienna: Böhlau, 1989): 155–80
- *Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium, and the Early Medieval West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986)

- “The Imperial Edge: Italo-Byzantine Identity, Movement and Integration, A.D. 650–950,” in *Studies of the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire*, ed. Hélène Ahrweiler and Angeliki E. Laiou (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1998): 17–52
- “The Liturgy of War in the Early Middle Ages: Crisis, Litanies, and the Carolingian Monarchy,” *Viator*, 15 (1984): 1–23
- McHardy, Alison K., “Liturgy and Propaganda in the Diocese of Lincoln during the Hundred Years’ War,” *Studies in Church History*, 18 (1982): 215–27
- McKinnon, James, *The Advent Project: The Later-seventh-century Creation of the Roman Mass Proper* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000)
- McLaughlin, Megan, *Consorting with Saints: Prayer for the Dead in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994)
- McLaughlin, R. Emmet, “The World Eclipsed? Preaching in the Early Middle Ages,” *Traditio*, 46 (1991): 77–122
- Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context*, ed. Esther Cohen and Mayke de Jong (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2001)
- Memoria: Der geschichtliche Zeugniswert des liturgischen Gedenkens im Mittelalter*, ed. Karl Schmid and Joachim Wollasch (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1984)
- Meneghini, Roberto and Riccardo Santangeli Valenziani, *Roma nell’Altomedioevo: Topografia e urbanistica della città dal V al X secolo* (Rome: Libreria dello Stato, 2004)
- Meyer, Hans Bernhard, *Eucharistie: Geschichte, Theologie, Pastoral* (Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1989)
- Meyvaert, Paul, *Benedict, Gregory, Bede and Others* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1977)
- Mordek, Hubert, “Rom, Byzanz und die Franken im 8. Jahrhundert: zur Überlieferung und kirchenpolitischen Bedeutung der Synodus Romana Papst Gregors III. vom 732 (mit Edition),” in *Person und Gemeinschaft im Mittelalter: Karl Schmid zum fünfundsiebzigsten Geburtstag*, ed. Gerd Althoff et al. (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1988): 123–56
- Muir, Edward, *Civic Ritual in Renaissance Venice* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981)
- Müller, Iso, “Frauen rechts, Männer links: Historische Platzverteilung in der Kirche,” *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde*, 57 (1961), 65–81.
- Nason, Corey, “The ‘Missa pro principe’: A Merovingian Votive Mass for the Mayors of the Palace?” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 45 (2003): 430–39
- Nautin, Pierre, “Le rite du ‘fermentum’ dans les églises urbaines de Rome,” *Ephemerides liturgicae*, 96 (1982): 510–22
- Negotiating the Gift: Pre-modern Figurations of Exchange*, ed. Gadi Algazi, Valentin Groebner, and Bernhard Jussen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003)

- Neher, Andrew, *The Psychology of Transcendence* (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1990)
- Nelson, Janet L., "Ritual and Reality in Early Medieval *Ordines*," in *The Materials, Sources, and Methods of Ecclesiastical History*, ed. Derek Baker (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975): 41–51. Reprinted in Janet L. Nelson, *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe* (London/Ronceverte: The Hambledon Press, 1986), 329–40
- Nickl, Georg, *Der Anteil des Volkes an der Messliturgie im Frankenreiche von Chlodwig bis Karls den Grossen* (Innsbruck: Felizian Rauch, 1930)
- Noble, Thomas F.X., "The Papacy in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries," in *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Volume 2, c.700–c.900*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge/New York, 1995): 563–86
- *The Republic of St. Peter: The Birth of the Papal State, 680–825* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984)
- "Rome in the Seventh Century," in *Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies on his Life and Influence*, ed. Michael Lapidge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005): 68–87
- Nordhagen, Per Jonas, *The Frescoes of John VII (A.D. 705–707) in S. Maria Antiqua in Rome* (Rome: L'Erma, 1968)
- Nowacki, Edward, "The Latin Antiphon and the Question of Frequency of Interpolation," *Plain-song and Medieval Music*, 21 (2012): 23–39
- Nussbaum, Otto, "Die Bewertung von Rechts und Links in der römischen Liturgie," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, 5 (1962): 158–71
- Ó Carragáin, Éamonn, *Ritual and the Rood: Liturgical Images and the Old English Poems of the "Dream of the Rood" Tradition* (London: British Library/Toronto & Buffalo, NY: University of Toronto Press, 2005)
- The Oxford History of Christian Worship*, ed. Geoffrey Wainwright and Karen B. Westerfield Tucker (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006)
- Palazzo, Eric, *A History of Liturgical Books from the Beginning to the Thirteenth Century*, trans. Madeleine Beaumont (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1998)
- *Liturgie et société au Moyen Age* (Paris: Aubier, 2000)
- *Les sacramentaires de Fulda. Etude sur l'iconographie et la liturgie à l'époque ottonienne* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1994)
- Paxton, Frederick S., *Christianizing Death: The Creation of a Ritual Process in Early Medieval Europe* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990)
- Penn, Michael Philip, *Kissing Christians: Ritual and Community in the Late Ancient Church* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005)
- Petersen, Nils Holger, "Liturgical Drama: New Approaches," in *Bilan et perspectives des études médiévales (1993–1998)*, ed. Jacqueline Hamesse (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004): 625–44

- Peterson, Eric, *The Angels and the Liturgy: The Status and Significance of the Holy Angels in Worship*, trans. Ronald Walls (London: Darton, 1964)
- Pfaff, Richard W., *Medieval Latin Liturgy: A Select Bibliography* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982)
- Pietri, Charles, *Christiana respublica: éléments d'une enquête sur le christianisme antique* (3 vols, Rome: Ecole française de Rome, Palais Farnèse, 1997)
- Prex eucharistica, Volumen III, Studia*, ed. Albert Gerhards, Heinzgerd Brakmann, and Martin Klöckener (Fribourg: Academic Press, 2005)
- Rees, Wilhelm, *Die Strafgewalt der Kirche. Das geltende kirchliche Strafrecht, dargestellt auf der Grundlage seiner Entwicklungsgeschichte* (Berlin: Dunckler & Humblot, 1993)
- Reinburg, Virginia, "Liturgy and the Laity in Late Medieval and Reformation France," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 23 (1992): 526–47
- Reynolds, Roger E., "Clerics in the Early Middle Ages: Hierarchies and Functions," in *Clerics in the Early Middle Ages: Hierarchy and Image* (Aldershot/Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1999), no. I: 1–31
- "The Organisation, Law and Liturgy of the Western Church, 700–900," in *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Volume 2, c.700–c.900*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995): 587–621
- Richards, Jeffrey, *Consul of God. The Life and Times of Gregory the Great* (London/Boston: Henley Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980)
- *The Popes and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages, 476–752* (London/Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979)
- Riedinger, Rudolf, *Kleine Schriften zu den Konzilsakten des 7. Jahrhunderts*, *Instrumenta patristica*, 34 (Steenbrugge: In Abbatia S. Petri/Turnhout: Brepols, 1998)
- Riti e rituali nelle società medievali*, ed. Jacques Chiffolleau, Lauro Martines, and Agostino Paravicini Bagliani (Spoleto: Centro italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, 1994)
- Rivard, Derek A., *Blessing the World: Ritual and Lay Piety in Medieval Religion* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2009)
- Roma dall'antichità al medioevo. Archeologia e storia nel Museo nazionale romano*, ed. Maria Stella Arena, Paolo Delogu, Lidia Paroli, Marco Ricci, Lucia Saguì, and Laura Venditelli (Milan: Electa, 2001)
- Roma dall'antichità al medioevo II: contesti tardoantichi e altomedievali*, ed. Lidia Paroli and Laura Venditelli (Milan: Electa, 2001)
- Roma Felix: Formation and Reflections of Medieval Rome*, ed. Éamonn Ó Carragáin and Carol Neuman de Vegvar (Aldershot/Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007)
- Roma fra Oriente e Occidente*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, 49 (2 vols, Spoleto: Presso la sede del Centro, 2001)
- Roma medievale*, ed. André Vauchez (Rome: GLF editori Laterza, 2001)

- Roma medievale: aggiornamenti*, ed. Paolo Delogu (Florence: All'insegna del giglio, 1998)
- Roma nell'alto medioevo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, 48 (2 vols, Spoleto: Presso la sede del Centro, 2001)
- Romano, John F., "Announcing the Station in Early-Medieval Rome: A New Interpretation of 'statio' in OR I, 108," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 51 (2009): 345–51
- "The Fates of Liturgies: Towards a History of the First Roman Ordo," *Antiphon*, 11 (2007): 43–77
- "Joy in Waiting? The History of Gaudete Sunday," *Mediaeval Studies*, 72 (2010): 75–124
- Rosenwein, Barbara H., "Feudal War and Monastic Peace: Cluniac Liturgy as Ritual Aggression," *Viator*, 2 (1971): 129–57
- *To be the Neighbor of Saint Peter: The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property, 909–1049* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989)
- Rubin, Miri, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)
- Sansterre, Jean-Marie, *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne (milieu du VI^e s. – fin du IX^e s.)* (2 vols, Brussels: Palais des académies, 1993)
- Santa Maria Antiqua al Foro Romano cento anni dopo: atti del colloquio internazionale, Roma, 5–6 maggio 2000*, ed. John Osborne, J. Rasmus Brandt, and Giuseppe Morganti (Rome: Campisano Editore, 2004)
- Saxer, Victor, *Sainte-Marie-Majeure: une basilique de Rome dans l'histoire de la ville et de son église, V^e–XIII^e siècle* (Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 2001)
- "L'utilisation par la liturgie de l'espace urbain et suburbain: L'exemple de Rome dans l'antiquité et le haut moyen âge," in *Actes du XI^e Congrès international d'Archéologie chrétienne, Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève, et Aosta, 21–28 septembre 1986* (3 vols, Rome: Ecole française de Rome/Vatican City: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia cristiana, 1989), vol. 2: 917–1031
- Schimmelpfennig, Bernhard, "Die Bedeutung Roms im päpstlichen Zeremoniell," in *Rom in hohen Mittelalter. Studien zu den Romvorstellungen und zur Rompolitik vom 10. bis zum 12. Jahrhundert*, ed. Bernhard Schimmelpfennig and Ludwig Schmugge (Sigmaringen: J. Thorbecke, 1992): 47–61
- "Die Funktion des Papstpalastes und der kurialen Gesellschaft im päpstlichen Zeremoniell vor und während des Schismas," in *Génese et débuts du Grand Schisme d'Occident 1362–1394 (Avignon 25–28 septembre 1978)* (Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1980): 317–28
- *Das Papsttum: Von der Antike bis zur Renaissance* (4th edn, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1996)

- Séjourné, Paul, "Saint Isidore de Séville et la liturgie wisigothique," in *Miscellanea Isidoriana: homenaje a S. Isidoro de Sevilla en el XII centenario de su muerte* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1936): 221–51
- Le Septième siècle, changements et continuités: actes du Colloque bilatéral franco-britannique tenu au Warburg Institute les 8–9 juillet 1988 = *The Seventh Century, Change and Continuity: Proceedings of a joint French and British Colloquium held at the Warburg Institute 8–9 July 1988*, ed. Jacques Fontaine and J.N. Hillgarth (London: The Warburg Institute, University of London, 1992)
- Sheerin, Daniel, "Eucharistic Liturgy," in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, ed. Susan Ashley Harvey and David G. Hunter (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2008): 711–43
- "The Liturgy," in *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*, ed. F.A.C. Mantello and A.G. Rigg (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1996): 157–82
- Smith, Julia M.H., *Europe after Rome: A New Cultural History, 500–1000* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)
- Sorci, Pietro, *L'eucaristia per la remissione dei peccati: Ricerca nel sacramentario Veronese* (Palermo: Istituto Superiore di Scienze Religiose, 1979)
- Spain, Suzanne, "'The Promised Blessing': The Iconography of the Mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore," *The Art Bulletin*, 61 (1979): 518–40
- The Spectrum of Ritual: A Biogenetic Structural Analysis*, ed. Eugene G. D'Aquili, Charles D. Laughlin, and John McManus (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979)
- Stein, Ernest, *Histoire du Bas-empire* (2 vols, Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1959)
- *Opera minora selecta* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1968)
- "La période byzantine de la papauté," *Catholic Historical Review*, 21 (1935): 129–63
- Straw, Carole, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*, Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 14 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988)
- Taft, Robert F., *Through Their Own Eyes: Liturgy as the Byzantines Saw It* (Berkeley: InterOrthodox Press, 2006)
- "Was the Eucharistic Anaphora Recited Secretly or Aloud? The Ancient Tradition and What Became of It," in *Worship Traditions in Armenia and the Neighboring Christian East* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press/New Rochelle, NY: St. Nersess Armenian Seminary, 2006): 15–57
- Tanghe, D.A. "L'eucharistie pour la rémission des péchés," *Irénikon*, 24 (1961): 165–81
- Tellenbach, Gerd, *Römischer und christlicher Reichsgedanke in der Liturgie des frühen Mittelalters* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1934)

- Teteriatnikov, Natalia, "For whom is Theodotus Praying? An Interpretation of the Program of the Private Chapel in S. Maria Antiqua," *Cahiers archéologiques*, 41 (1993): 37–46
- Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Mayke De Jong and Francis Theuws, with Carine van Rhijn (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2001)
- Turner, Victor, "Ritual, Tribal and Catholic," *Worship*, 50 (1976): 504–26
- Twyman, Susan, *Papal Ceremonial at Rome in the Twelfth Century* (London/Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2002)
- Ullmann, Walter, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages: A Study in the Ideological Relation of Clerical to Lay Power* (3rd edn, London: Methuen, 1970)
- Van Dijk, S.J.P., "Historical Liturgy and Liturgical History," *Dominican Studies*, 2 (1949): 161–82
- "The Urban and Papal Rites in the VII and VIII Century in Rome," *Sacris erudiri*, 12 (1961): 411–87
- Van Dijk, S.J.P. and J. Hazelden Walker, *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy: The Liturgy of the Papal Court and the Franciscan Order in the Thirteenth Century* (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1960)
- Van Engen, John, "Christening the Romans," *Traditio*, 52 (1997): 1–45
- Vogel, Cyrille, "An Alienated Liturgy," *Concilium*, 72 (1972): 11–25
- *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. and revised William G. Storey and Niels Krogh Rasmussen (Washington, DC: The Pastoral Press, 1986)
- "Une mutation culturelle inexpliquée: Le passage de l'eucharistie communautaire à la messe privée," *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 54 (1980): 231–50
- "Versus ad orientem: L'orientation dans les *Ordines romani* du haut moyen âge," *La Maison-Dieu*, 70 (1962): 67–99
- Wagner, Peter, *Einführung in die gregorianischen Melodien: Ein Handbuch der Choralwissenschaft* (4th edn, 3 vols, Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1962)
- Wegman, Herman A.J., *Christian Worship in East and West: A Study Guide to Liturgical History*, trans. Gordon W. Lathrop (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1985)
- *Liturgie in der Geschichte des Christentums* (Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1994)
- Wellesz, Egon, "Gregory the Great's Letter on the *Alleluia*," *Annales musicologiques*, 2 (1954): 7–26
- Williams, Peter F., *The Organ in Western Culture* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993)
- Willis, Geoffrey Grimshaw, *Essays in Early Roman Liturgy* (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1964)
- *Further Essays in Early Roman Liturgy* (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1968)

- *A History of Early Roman Liturgy to the Death of Pope Gregory the Great* (London: The Boydell Press, 1994)
- Wilmart, André, *Auteurs spirituels et textes dévots du Moyen Age, Etudes d'histoire littéraire* (Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1932)
- Wilson, David Sloan, *Darwin's Cathedral: Evolution, Religion, and the Nature of Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002)
- Wilson, Edward O., *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2000 [1975])
- Young, Karl, *The Drama of the Medieval Church* (2 vols, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933)

This page has been left blank intentionally

Index

- abbots, 101–2, 130, 154, 167, 177, 195
Abel, 53, 176–7
acolytes, 37, 40, 52, 83, 85–6, 92, 94–5, 114
 role in the First Roman Ordo, 229–34,
 237–40, 244, 246–8, 259, 261–6,
 268, 270–73, 275
 stationarius (stational) acolyte, 37, 92,
 231
Acts of the Apostles, 48, 50, 91, 132–3,
 161, 164, 254, 263
Adeodatus, pope, 95, 183
Agatho, pope, 87, 95
Agnus Dei, chant, 42, 44, 58, 60, 65, 71–3,
 244–5, 271
alb, 38, 40, 235, 256
Alexandria, 13, 19, 113, 127, 132, 142,
 158–9
Alleluia, chant, 42, 44, 223, 238, 263
altar, 1–2, 41, 52, 56, 63, 65–6, 70, 82–3,
 87–8, 95, 99–101, 114–17, 123,
 128, 143, 151, 162, 167, 172, 179,
 186, 190–91, 199, 206,
 and the architecture of Roman
 churches, 29, 31–3, 35
 role in the First Roman Ordo, 223,
 225, 234, 236–9, 241–6, 248, 258,
 262–3, 265–72, 275
ama, *amula*, flagon, 66, 225–6, 232,
 240–41, 265–6
Amalar of Metz, archbishop, 22, 47, 65–6,
 204, 226, 258
ambo, 60, 154, 238–9, 263–4
amice, 38, 235, 256
ampulla, flask, 92, 96, 231
amula, *see ama*
amulets, 164, 166–7
Anastasius of Sinai, monk, 21, 123, 127, 131,
 145–6, 155, 158, 161, 165, 197
Anastasius the Persian, saint, 12, 19,
 116–17, 200
Anastasius II of Antioch, monk and
 patriarch of Antioch, 21–2, 132,
 148
Andrieu, M., 207, 212, 219–28, 257
angels, 42, 53, 64, 120–23, 126, 129, 129,
 150, 159, 165, 188, 199–201, 210,
 242
Angenendt, A., 76, 202–5
anointing, 145, 160, 216
anthropology, 23, 213
Antioch, 13, 21–2, 72, 111, 132, 148, 157,
 160
antiphoner, Roman, 17, 41, 86, 126,
 180–81, 183–4, 187, 194
antiphons, chants, 41–3, 45, 126, 187, 190,
 194, 248
 Communion antiphon, 42–3, 227,
 247–8, 273–4
 Entrance antiphon (introit), 41, 43,
 222, 227, 236, 238, 261–2
 Offertory antiphon, 42–3, 265–7
apocrisarius, *apocrisarii*, 1–2, 122
Apostles, 13, 49–50, 116, 145, 167, 251
apostolicus, papal title, 86, 230–31, 233,
 250–51
aquamanus, hand basin, 221–2, 232, 234
Arator, author, 161, 164
arcarius, 87, 101, 252
archaeology, of the city of Rome, 22–3; *see*
 also Crypta Balbi
archdeacon, 37, 83, 91–2, 97, 104–5, 107,
 164, 226, 229, 234, 236, 240–47,

- 261, 265–7, 269–75; *see also*
 Paschal; Theophylact
archiparafonista, 226, 236, 241, 256–7
 architecture, 27, 31–3
 archpriest, 104, 107, 237, 262
 Artemios, saint, 19, 54
 Atchley, E.G.C.F., 28, 249
 Augustine, saint, 113, 145, 166
- baptism, 12, 51, 58, 79, 90, 99, 111, 125–6,
 144–7, 159, 161–3, 167, 190, 193,
 195, 200, 209, 231, 253
 Basilica/Church of the Savior (San
 Giovanni in Laterano), church,
 30–32, 55, 232, 251, 253–4
 Bell, C., 62, 213
 Benedict II, pope, 10, 95
 Bible, 41, 43, 48–9, 66, 79, 132–3, 165, 176
 Bishop, E., 173
 bishops, 83–5, 88–9, 95, 97, 103–5, 107,
 111, 114–15, 127–9, 131–2,
 138–9, 143–4, 147, 149, 152–4,
 158, 162–3, 166, 169, 177, 180,
 188, 198, 200
 role in the First Roman Ordo, 227,
 233, 237–8, 240, 244–6, 248, 257,
 266–7, 270–72, 274–5
 suburbicarian bishops, 89, 257
 Blaauw, S. de, 15–16
 blessings, 25, 39, 88, 124, 179–80, 206,
 210, 224, 231, 233, 235, 248,
 272–5
 Boniface, monk, 18, 115, 146, 155, 163,
 165–7, 209
 Boniface V, pope, 94
 Bossy, J., 5, 109
 bronze, 32, 253
 Byzantine Empire, 18–19, 26–9, 61, 71, 73,
 98, 120, 126, 181, 214, 259
- Cain, 159, 176
 candle-bearers, 59, 83, 86, 112, 248, 275
 candles, candlesticks, 36, 37, 66, 83, 86,
 224, 232, 237, 239, 248, 261–2,
 264, 275
- Canon, Roman, prayer, 46, 55, 64, 173,
 176, 189, 243, 258, 261, 268–9
 Canon, Visigothic, prayer, 118, 178
cantatorium, 232, 238, 254
 cantor, 39, 43–5, 59, 223, 236, 238, 256–7,
 263
 Carolingians, 4, 36, 62, 171, 216, 219–20
 catechumens, 125–6, 261
 Chair, papal, 33–4, 104, 233–4, 238,
 240–41, 244–7, 265–7, 270–73
 chalice, *calix*, 36–7, 52, 66, 114–15, 159,
 189, 192, 226, 232, 239–46, 265–7,
 269–70, 272–3
 chasuble, 38–40, 52, 223, 234–5, 237,
 239–40, 243, 246, 255, 262
 chrism, 83, 145–6, 231–2
 Christmas, 45, 49, 69, 131–2
 Chronicle of Theophanes, 18, 160, 162
cingulum, belt, 38, 235
 clergy, 2, 7, 16, 20, 25, 45–6, 48, 51–2,
 54, 56–61, 64–71, 74, 78–82, 85,
 109, 111–13, 115–17, 120, 122,
 128, 130–33, 135, 141–4, 146–9,
 151–5, 157–8, 166, 168–9,
 188, 202–3, 206–12
 in the papal court, 87–103, 105, 107
 role in the First Roman Ordo, 227, 233,
 250, 255, 257, 262, 267–8, 270–72
 role in the Mass, 29–33
 vestments of, 37–41
see also acolytes; *arcarius*; archdeacon;
 archpriest; bishops; deacons;
defensor; *nominculator*; notaries;
 ostiary; popes; priests; *primicerius*
 of the *defensores*; *primicerius* of the
 notaries; *sacellarius*; *secundicerius*
 of the notaries; subdeacons;
vesterarius; *vicedominus*
- collect, first prayer, 46, 58, 116, 118, 238,
 263
commixtio, 47, 65, 114–15, 192, 226, 245,
 270, 272
Communicantes, prayer, 124–5, 268
communio, 154, 228, 245, 247

- communion, Christian unity, 126, 150–52, 154–5, 157–9, 161, 195; *see also* Eucharist
communitas, 139
confessio, 33, 93, 240, 258, 266
confirmo, 245–7, 259
 Canon, pope, 90–91, 95, 103, 133
 consecration,
 of the pope, 46, 91
 of the Eucharist, 46–7, 52, 61, 97, 114, 123, 154, 178, 187–8, 191–2, 195, 216, 245
 Constantine, pope, 39, 72, 101, 106, 128
 Constantinople, 13, 19, 27–9, 39, 71, 100, 111, 122, 126, 130, 156, 180, 214
 corporal, altar cloth, 66, 239–40, 265
 Corpus Christi, feast, 86, 217
 councils, ecclesiastical, 19–20, 33, 77
 Council in Trullo (Quinisextum), 19–20, 55–8, 61, 71, 73, 95, 105, 135, 144–5, 147, 164–5, 179
 Lateran Council of 649, 19–20, 77, 79, 119–20
 Roman Council of 601, 19–20, 101
 Roman Council of 721, 19–20, 165
 Roman Council of 732, 19–20, 194
 Roman Council of 743, 19–20, 143, 153
 Roman Council of 745, 19–20, 165–6
 Second Vatican Council, 54, 63, 213
 Third Council of Constantinople, 19–20, 126
 court, Frankish, 22, 65
 court, imperial, 28, 98–9
 court, papal, 6–7, 14, 81–2, 94–5, 99, 101–7, 109, 208
 description, 76–80
 and liturgy, 75–6
 membership, 87–93
 creed, 51, 53, 120, 146, 160, 167, 208
 cross, crosses, 38–9, 86, 100–101, 154, 162, 199, 200, 248, 256, 262
 sign of the cross, 237, 241, 267–8, 274
 cross-bearers, 83, 86, 112, 233, 248, 275
 Crypta Balbi, archaeological excavation, 23, 67, 199
 dalmatic, 38, 40, 235, 256
 deacons, 40, 83, 88, 91, 95, 103–5, 107, 119, 125, 157–8, 177, 208
 actions in the Mass, 229–30, 234–45, 248, 261–75
 regional deacons, 229, 264
defensor, defensores, 106, 149, 232–3, 251–2
 regional *defensores*, 83, 231, 234, 242, 267
 demons, 58, 117, 127, 163–8, 200, 210
 Deusdedit, pope, 94
diaconiae, 13, 233, 255
 divination, 165–6
 Divine Office, 7, 15, 50, 191, 200
 divinization, 121–2, 193
 Donus, pope, 95
draconarius soldiers, 78, 83, 86, 248, 259, 275
 Duchesne, L., 75
 East, direction of prayer, 67–8, 238, 262
 Easter, 16, 30, 42, 44–5, 49, 55, 81, 90–91, 100, 131, 144, 162, 184
 and the First Roman Ordo, 230–32, 252–3, 254
 Easter Vigil, 162, 253
 Easter Week, 16, 45, 49, 55, 90, 144, 254
 Ekonomou, A.J., 26
 emperors, Byzantine, 1, 13, 27–9, 70–71, 74, 94, 98, 100, 122, 135, 144, 156, 185, 209; *see also* Maurice; Justinian II
 epistles, 48, 50, 223, 235, 263
 epistolary, 48, 232, 254
 Eucharist, 46
 distribution of, 1–2, 42, 87, 97, 104, 153, 225, 227, 246–7, 271–4
 earliest references to, 111
 Eucharistic bread, 25, 29–30, 42, 46–7, 52–3, 56–7, 65–6, 68, 74, 91–2, 97, 100, 104, 113–17, 122, 125, 151, 157–60, 186–8, 192, 195, 197,

- 203–4, 226–8, 245–7, 257–9, 262, 265–7, 269–75
- Eucharistic wine, 25, 29–30, 42, 46–7, 52–3, 56–8, 66, 68, 91, 97, 104–5, 113–17, 122, 158–60, 173, 188, 192, 195, 203–4, 227–8, 245–7, 257–9, 265, 269, 272–5
- offered for the dead, 164, 196–8
- power against sin, 190
- reception of, 2, 55, 57–8, 61, 74, 94, 100, 104, 114, 116, 120–22, 127–8, 144–5, 148, 150, 154–5, 160, 188, 195, 245–7, 274
- and salvation, 195
- submitted to an ordeal, 158
- as a symbol of unity, 2, 112–13, 110–17, 149, 208, 217
- euchologion, Greek prayer book, 17, 70, 126, 179
- Eugene I, pope, 58
- evangelary, 35, 37, 48, 52, 232, 234, 238–9, 254, 262–4
- exarchs, 1, 13, 83, 103, 135
- excommunication, 148–55, 162, 169, 209, 230, 236
- exorcism, 145, 161, 166–7, 200
- fermentum*, 92, 114, 259, 270–71
- Fiat commixtio*, prayer, 47, 192, 245, 272
- final prayer, 47, 58, 116, 248, 275
- First Roman Ordo (OR I), 16, 25–6, 58, 62–3, 65, 76, 77, 81–6, 89–91, 93–5, 96, 98, 101–2, 104–7
- commentary on, 249–59
- overview of papal Mass of, 261–75
- presentation and translation, 229–48
- rereading the edition of, 219–29
- fons*, ewer, 226, 241, 267
- fraction, 60, 244–5, 271
- frescoes, 23, 35, 176, 217
- Geertz, C., 213
- Gelasian Sacramentary, 12, 146, 258–9
- gender differences in liturgy, 34–5, 99–101; *see also* Women
- gifts, 53, 56, 66, 71, 93, 95, 97, 125, 146, 177–9, 183, 185–6, 190, 192–3, 197, 199, 210, 245, 259, 266
- gift-giving, 201–6
- Gloria in excelsis Deo*, chant, 42, 44, 58, 60, 72, 130, 189, 238, 263
- Gloria patri*, chant, 41, 44, 227, 237, 247–8, 262, 274
- Gluckman, M., 136
- God, 1–2, 8, 35–6, 41–2, 47, 53, 58, 80, 107, 110, 116–17, 119–26, 129–30, 138–9, 148, 151, 156–7, 160–61, 165–8, 172, 174–83, 185–95, 197–9, 202–6, 208, 210–11, 231–2, 248
- gold, 33, 35, 232, 236, 253
- Gospel, 42, 48–50, 52, 55, 67, 120, 132, 154, 184, 189, 239, 254, 264; *see also* evangelary
- Goths, 9, 118, 130, 173, 178, 180
- gradual, 42, 43–4, 238, 254, 263
- Greek, language, 12, 17, 19, 22, 27–8, 79, 84–5, 98, 122, 146, 182–84, 190, 194, 197, 200, 216
- Gregorian Sacramentary, 16–17, 70, 110, 123, 138, 173, 183–4, 187, 189, 192, 194, 199–200, 203
- Gregory I, pope, 7, 9, 13, 14, 19, 22, 28, 55, 56, 60, 63, 66, 70, 80, 88, 92, 94, 97, 106, 112, 123, 132, 160, 167, 172, 180, 182–3, 185, 188, 190–91, 195–6, 198, 205–6
- and excommunication, 149–55
- and heretics, 156–7
- and Jews, 162–63
- and modification of prayers, 64–5
- and monks, 101–3
- and pagans and magicians, 163–5, 167–8
- and regulation of ritual, 142–5
- and sermons, 50–51
- sources for, 20–21
- theories of prayer, 174–9
- and unity, 128–9

- Gregory II, pope, 65, 115, 133, 135, 146, 163, 183, 201, 205, 252
- Gregory III, pope, 146–7, 164–5, 194, 199
- groom, 83–4, 230
- Gy, P.M., 4
- hagiography, 19, 126–8
- Hanc igitur*, prayer, 68, 268
- heaven, 36, 80, 116, 120–21, 123, 125–6, 130, 138, 151, 172, 175–8, 183, 187–8, 190, 192–7, 199–201, 206, 210
- heresy, 71, 119, 122, 126, 130, 134, 145, 154, 156–61, 168, 209, 216–17; *see also* Monophysitism; Monotheletism
- hierarchy, 16, 75, 78, 80, 86, 93–4, 97, 103, 111, 129, 139, 142, 208
- Holy Spirit, 49, 66, 111, 121–2, 124, 146, 178, 185, 187–8, 195, 199
- holy water, 148, 167, 184
- Holy Week, 15, 100
- Honorius I, pope, 153, 180
- hostia*, 196–7, 245, 259
- icons, 11, 35–6, 156, 162
- idols, 163–5, 167–8
- incense, 28, 36, 86, 200, 214, 236–8
- inmixtio*, 115, 245, 272
- Institution Narrative, 46, 66
- Isidore of Seville, 21, 117–19, 143–5, 155, 159–60, 172, 178–9, 184–5, 198
- Italy, 1, 9, 13, 17, 23, 28, 66, 70, 97, 135
- Ite missa est*, dismissal, 25, 53, 248, 275
- Jay, N., 100
- Jerusalem, 13, 25, 45, 111, 152, 158, 184
- Jesus, 1–2, 35–6, 45–7, 49, 53, 66, 113, 115, 119, 121, 126, 129–30, 132, 145, 156, 158–9, 168, 174–6, 178, 189–92, 195, 201, 203, 205–6, 208, 216, 231, 245
- Jews, 142, 161–3, 168, 209
- Job, 160–61, 176–7
- John the Almsgiver, patriarch of Alexandria, 19, 127–8, 132, 142, 148, 186, 191
- Jungmann, J.A., 207, 258
- Jussen, B., 202–4
- Justinian II, Byzantine emperor, 128, 135, 180
- Justinianic Plague, 9, 102, 112, 185, 198
- Kiss of Peace, 2, 47, 52, 61–2, 105, 116–18, 120–21, 178, 237, 244, 262, 270
- Krautheimer, R., 22, 27, 96
- Kyrie eleison*, 41–2, 44, 59–60, 127, 185, 200, 238, 262–3
- laity,
 - misbehavior at Mass, 147–8
 - papal liturgy, as a part of, 95–102
 - participation in the Mass, 54–62, 118–20, 142
 - requirements for Mass and baptism, 144
- Last Supper, 46, 66, 115, 189
- Lateran, 10, 60, 86, 92, 104, 230, 232, 239, 253–4, 264
- Latin, language, 12, 41, 48, 51, 55, 63, 74, 79, 84, 89, 111–12, 114, 120, 122, 126, 146–7, 208, 216, 219–20, 257
- lectionaries, 17, 49
- lector, 39, 88, 236, 256
- Leo I, pope, 50–51, 145, 163
- Leo II, pope, 130
- Leo III, pope, 84
- Leontios of Neapolis, author, 19, 127, 158
- letters, papal, 13–14, 17–18, 28, 33, 50, 55, 60, 70, 94, 115, 129–30, 143–6, 149–50, 152–4, 162, 164–8, 177, 204, 209, 212
- Lex orandi, lex credendi*, 51–2
- Liber diurnus*, 17–18, 50, 60, 91–3, 130
- Liber pontificalis*, 17, 37, 39, 58, 60, 64, 66, 69, 73, 91, 94–5, 99, 101, 103, 106, 128, 133, 135, 156–7, 251
- Libera nos*, prayer, 47, 199, 269–70
- liturgical furnishings, 36–7, 52, 66–7, 86, 103, 208
- liturgical straw, 36, 58, 114, 232, 246, 273

- liturgy,
 Greek or Eastern influence, 26–9
 heavenly, 123
 military influence in, 77–8, 106
 papal, 5–6, 20, 25, 28, 29–40, 50, 54,
 62–73, 81, 90, 100, 103–4, 108–9,
 141, 210, 214, 254
 and political power, 210–12
 preference for right side in, 84–5, 99
 study of, 3–6, 207–8
 as work, 207–8
- Liutprand, Lombard king, 69, 128, 181–2
- Lombards, 9, 18, 128, 134, 157, 164, 173,
 182, 253
- magic, 58, 163–8, 209
- Major Litany, 84, 182
- mappula*, maniple, 39, 231, 235
- Martin I, pope, 1–3, 18, 55, 57, 71, 84, 135,
 195, 217
- Martyn, J.R.C., 185
- Mary, saint, 124, 158, 162, 199
- Mass,
 actions of, 29–30, 52, 74, 110–17, 138,
 208, 229–48, 261–75
 celebration of, 1, 15, 26, 104, 127–8,
 131–2, 143, 148, 153, 155, 157, 180,
 182, 184, 188, 197, 200–201, 217
 etymology, 25
 and favoritism for men, 99
 music of, 40–46, 52–4, 208
 overview of, 261–75
 participation of the laity in, 54–62, 74,
 208
 reception of, 62–73
 salvation, 191–5
 study of, 5, 207–8
 visual appearance, 29–40, 74, 208
 votive, 196, 205
- Maurice, Byzantine emperor, 70, 131, 182,
 185
- Mauss, M., 201–3
- Maximus the Confessor, 18, 21, 110,
 119–22, 138, 159, 209
- mayors of the palace, 69, 233–4, 252, 255
- McKinnon, J., 45
- Mediterranean world, 6–7, 9, 21, 127, 131,
 134, 141–2, 168
- Memento*, prayer, 53, 68, 173, 191, 268
- Merulana*, 231, 252–3
- militaris persona*, 229, 250
- military, militarization, 13, 25, 77–8, 81,
 98, 106, 135, 158, 229, 250, 259
- missa*, 25, 53, 65, 115, 229–30, 248, 275
- monks, 83, 101–2, 105, 107, 119, 127,
 149–51, 171, 177–79, 187,
 190–91, 196–7, 208, 219, 248, 275
- Monophysitism, 73, 134, 156–7, 159
- Monothelitism, 1, 119, 122, 130, 134, 156,
 159–60
- mosaics, 11, 23, 30, 35–7, 40, 48
- Moschos, John, author, 19, 150, 157–8
- MS Albi, Bibliothèque municipale 42 (Y),
 220–22, 224–6, 228
- MS Bern, Burgerbibliothek 289 (H), 220,
 222, 224
- MS St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 614 (G), 65,
 220–25, 249–50
- MS Wolfenbüttel, Landesbibliothek 4175
 (W), 220–24, 226–8
- music, *see* Mass, music of; antiphons
- Mystagogia*, 21, 120–22
- Naples, 162, 180
- Nelson, J., 16, 23, 82
- New Testament, 45, 48–9, 129, 254, 263
- Nobis quoque*, prayer, 53, 243, 269
- nobles, 55–6, 69, 96, 99–100, 107, 109,
 144, 149, 154, 164, 204–5, 227,
 240, 257, 265–6, 273–4
- nominculator*, 83–4, 87, 106, 231, 244, 247,
 252, 271, 275
- notaries, 93, 106, 165, 173, 225, 240, 244,
 252, 256, 265, 270–71
 regionary notaries, 83, 85, 93, 230–31,
 234, 242, 253, 267
- nuns, 70, 102, 124, 143, 149, 151–3
- Ó Carragáin, E., 73

- offerings (*oblata, oblationes*), 40, 46, 53, 56–8, 61, 68, 71, 93, 97–8, 100, 116, 151, 154, 159–60, 164, 177–8, 187–8, 196, 199, 210, 225, 227, 240–45, 257, 268
- Offertory, offering of bread and wine, 56, 68, 74, 91, 97, 113, 203, 209, 240–42, 261, 265–7; *see also* antiphons, Offertory antiphon
- offertory veil, 242–3, 267, 269
- Old Testament, 35, 48–9, 53, 167, 254, 263
- Opic, J.L., 73
- orans* posture, 116–17
- oratorium*, rug, 237, 257, 262
- ordo, ordines*, 15–16, 78–80, 96, 207–8, 214; *see also* First Roman Ordo (OR I)
- OR II, 34, 114–15
- OR XI, 42, 97, 99, 200
- OR XX, 82
- OR XXIII, 85, 100
- OR XXXIV, 114
- OR XLA, 89
- OR XLIX, 16, 195
- orthodoxy, 1, 8, 14, 64, 71, 130, 134, 142, 143, 145–6, 148, 150, 156–61, 163, 166, 168, 209, 212
- Osborn, J., 75
- osculo*, 118, 205, 236, 238, 239, 243, 253
- ostiary, 88, 235, 256
- “other,” 141–2
- paganism, 163–8, 209–10, 214
- Palazzo, E., 4
- pallium, 1–2, 33, 38–9, 80, 91, 234–5, 256
- papacy, 1–2, 5–6, 8, 13–14, 17, 25–7, 34, 42, 68, 70, 74, 75–6, 87–8, 90–92, 102–3, 107, 119, 129, 133, 163, 164, 167, 208–10, 212–16, 250, 252
- parafoanistae*, 236, 257
- pars/partes mulierum*, 34–5, 100, 227, 240–41, 247, 257–8, 266
- Paschal, archdeacon, 91, 164
- Pastoral Care*, 50
- paten, 36–7, 52, 66, 115–16, 232, 243–5, 247, 268–71
- Pater noster*, prayer, 47–8, 61, 64, 178, 198, 269
- patriarchs of Constantinople, 1, 71, 95, 100, 122, 160, 180
- Paul, saint, 50, 116, 129, 199
- Paul I, pope, 103, 133
- Paul the Deacon, monk, 18
- Pax domini*, prayer, 47, 115, 270
- Pelagius I, pope, 133, 154
- penitence, 41–2, 44, 131, 136, 144, 176–7, 263
- pericopes, 48–9, 263–4
- Per ipsum*, prayer, 129, 243, 269
- Per quem haec omnia*, prayer, 53, 243, 269
- Peter, saint, 33, 35, 50, 104, 107, 116, 186, 199, 251,
- Pfaff, R., 4
- pilgrims, 12, 96
- pin, 38–9, 234–5
- political Augustinianism, 211–13
- pontifex*, 39, 65, 214, 224, 232–48, 250
- popes, 12, 13, 25, 37–9, 50, 52, 64, 67, 76–7, 82–3, 85–6, 97, 102, 104, 107, 114–5, 129–30, 139, 141, 157, 166–7, 168–9, 173, 207, 208–9, 211–12, 214–16,
- role in the First Roman Ordo, 226, 230–48, 261–75
- see also* Adeodatus; Agatho; Benedict II; Boniface V; Conon; Constantine; Donus; Eugene I; Gregory I; Gregory II; Gregory III; Honorius I; Leo I; Leo II; Leo III; Martin I; Paul I; Pelagius I; Sergius I; Severinus; Theodore I; Vigilius; Vitalian; Zachary
- populus*, 97, 102, 227, 244
- prayers; *see also* collect; Canon; *Communicantes*; *Fiat commixtio*; final prayer; *Hanc igitur*; *Libera nos*; *Memento*; *Nobis quoque*; *Pater noster*; *Pax domini*; *Per ipsum*; *Per quem haec omnia*; preface; *Quam*

- oblationem; Qui pridie; Supplices te rogamus; Supra quae; Te igitur; Unde et memores; Universal Prayer*
- to aid in war, 180–81, 216
- breaking down temporal and spiritual realms, 198–201, 210
- controlling nature, 183–5, 209
- dating, 173
- for the dead, 68, 120, 190, 196–8, 216
- and gift-giving, 201–6
- against heresy, 157
- of the Mass, 46–7, 52–4, 208, 237
- military language in, 77
- as orienting Rome to God, 205–6, 210
- over the offerings, 46, 58, 116, 268
- private prayer of pope, 174, 262
- reflection of mentalities, 173–4
- sacriligious prayer, 165
- spiritual rewards from, 186–98
- study of, 171–2
- temporal rewards from, 179–86
- theories of, 174–9
- for unity, 110, 122–6, 138
- preface, prayer, 258–9, 268
- presbytery, 32, 86, 92, 217, 233–4, 236–7, 247–8, 255
- priests, 83, 87–8, 91, 94–5, 101, 103–5, 107, 114, 125, 143, 147, 153–4, 165, 177, 180, 187, 194, 197, 201, 208
- role in the First Roman Ordo, 227, 233, 238, 242, 245–8, 267–8, 271–2, 274–5
- primicerius* of the *defensores*, 83, 93, 225, 240–42, 244, 246, 265–7, 270, 273
- primicerius* of the notaries, 39, 83, 85, 93, 104, 107
- role in the First Roman Ordo, 225, 230, 234–5, 240–41, 244, 246–7, 225, 235, 240–41, 252, 256, 265–7, 270, 273
- processions, 81–5, 96, 101–3, 105–6, 112, 131, 136, 154, 182–4, 185, 200, 216, 230, 237, 261
- Psalms, 41–5, 49, 55, 119, 129, 143–4, 195–6
- pyx, 158, 237, 262
- Quam oblationem*, prayer, 53, 268
- Qui pridie*, prayer, 268
- Ravenna, 13, 103, 128, 131–2, 152, 154, 182
- readings, in Mass, 16–17, 25, 29, 42, 48–50, 61, 63, 74, 118–20, 126, 174, 184, 208, 235, 238–9, 254, 263–4
- recession, 30, 42, 47, 86, 105, 248, 275
- reflexio*, 232, 253
- regional, regionaries, 38–40, 83, 85–6, 93, 106, 223, 225, 229, 231, 234–5, 237–8, 240–48, 250, 253, 262–71, 273–5
- regions, ecclesiastical, 91, 185, 229–33, 237, 239, 250
- relics, 12, 33, 50, 92–4, 127, 135, 166–7, 258
- remissa*, 232, 253
- Riedinger, R., 120
- ritual, 2–3, 8, 16, 23–4, 25, 33, 37, 42, 54, 62, 66, 72, 74, 75, 77–8, 81, 87, 94, 96, 102, 107, 130, 133, 139, 141, 163–4, 166–68, 180, 201, 207, 209–16, 255
- biology of, 24, 137–8
- regulation of, 142–8
- and unity, 110–17, 135–7
- ritualism, 212–13
- Roman Empire, 28, 77, 97, 106, 134, 213–14, 250
- Roman Forum, 10, 27, 31, 35, 112
- Rome, city of, 2, 3, 5–7, 207, 210–12, 215–17
- defined by worship, 141–2, 151–3, 157, 164, 166, 169
- description of, in seventh and eighth centuries, 8–14
- and the First Roman Ordo, 220, 225–6, 228, 229, 249–55, 258–9, 261

- Greek or Eastern presence in, 12, 17, 26–9, 101
 and Mass in the early Middle Ages, 25–9, 31–2, 34–7, 39, 41, 44, 47, 53, 55–8, 61–5, 67–71, 73–4
 and the papal court, 75–8, 80–81, 88–91, 94–6, 99–105
 prayer in, 171–3, 176–7, 180–82, 185, 193–4, 198, 199, 203, 205–6
 sources for, 14–23
 unification through liturgy, 107, 109–14, 116–17, 122–3, 127, 130–39
ruga, gate, 32, 248, 259, 275
- sacellarius*, 83–4, 106, 231–2, 244, 247, 252, 271, 275
 sacks, used to carry the Eucharist to titular churches, 40, 114, 231–2, 244, 270
 sacramentaries, 16, 25; *see also* Gelasian Sacramentary; Gregorian Sacramentary
 sacrifice, 53, 97, 125, 128–9, 132, 156, 160–61, 163–4, 167–8, 177, 195–6, 198, 200, 205–6, 209, 214, 259
 sacristy, 230, 233, 246, 251, 273
 Saint Anastasius *ad aquas Salvias*, monastery, 12
 Saint Eusebius, church, 49
 saints, 16, 19, 33, 35–6, 49, 53–4, 80, 123–4, 126–7, 132, 139, 158, 166–7, 184, 190, 199–200, 210; *see also* Anastasius the Persian; Artemios; Augustine; Mary; Paul; Peter; Theodore of Sykeon
salus, 130, 175, 191–4, 196
saluto, 52, 231, 234–5, 237–8, 241–2, 245, 248, 253
 salvation, 8, 126, 130, 149, 151, 155, 160, 174–6, 178, 185, 188, 191–5, 199, 202–6, 211, 214
Sancta, Sacred Element, 47, 115, 237, 243, 257
Sanctus, chant, 42, 44, 58, 60, 73, 129, 268
 San Lorenzo fuori le Mura, church, 30–31
 San Lorenzo in Lucina, church, 49, 182
 San Pancrazio, church, 154, 174
 San Paolo fuori le Mura, church, 30–31, 35, 50, 66, 116, 176–7, 232, 253
 San Pietro in Vaticano, church, 30, 35, 50, 55, 66–7, 130, 154, 163, 166, 180, 182, 199, 215, 251, 253
 Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, church, 45–6
 Sant'Agata dei Goti, church, 157
 Sant'Agnese fuori le Mura, church, 11, 35, 38
 Santa Maria Antiqua, church, 27, 35, 36, 217
 Santa Maria dei Martiri (Pantheon), church, 11, 65, 167
 Santa Maria in Trastevere, church, 11
 Santa Maria Maggiore, church, 30, 35, 55, 58, 84, 112, 231, 251–2
 Santa Susanna, church, 72
 Santi XII Apostoli, church, 30, 50
 Santo Stefano Rotondo, church, 11
 San Venzio, oratory, 11
 Schimmelpfennig, B., 82, 84, 215
schola cantorum, 44, 45, 72, 83, 86, 222, 227–8, 235–8, 241, 245, 247–8, 256–7, 261–3, 265, 267–8, 271, 273–5
sciffus, 104, 116, 226, 232, 240, 245–6, 254, 265–6, 272
secretarium, 234–6, 248, 251, 258, 275
secundicerius of the notaries, 83, 93, 225, 234–5, 240–42, 244, 256, 265–7, 270
sedes vacans, papal interregnum, 90–92, 103–4, 252
senatorium, 34–5, 97–8, 225, 227, 240, 246–7, 257, 265
 Sergius I, pope, 46, 60, 65, 71–3, 91, 102–3, 106, 133, 135, 249
 sermons, 21, 50–51, 55, 74, 132, 147–8, 174, 179, 201, 208
 Severinus, pope, 37
 Severus, patriarch of Antioch, 156–8, 160
 sex, 24, 142–4, 148, 150, 158–9, 161, 209
 sextons, 83, 86, 232–3, 248, 254–5, 275
 silver, 32–3, 36, 185–6, 232, 253

- sin, 8, 131, 142, 145, 148–9, 151, 155,
158–9, 161, 177–8, 182–6,
189–91, 193, 197, 199, 203–4, 206,
210
- sindon*, linen cloth, 40, 114, 232, 240, 243,
266, 268
- solidus*, 221, 232, 253
- soul, 151, 153, 155, 171, 175–6, 178,
192–8, 204–6
- Spiritual Meadow*, 19, 46, 64, 157–8
- Statio*, 77, 111–12, 228, 230–33, 245, 251,
259, 272
- Stational liturgy, 25, 30–31, 67, 111, 230,
232–3, 251
- strainer, 36, 226, 232, 241, 266
- subdeacons, 37, 88, 91, 106, 143, 186,
222–4, 232, 234–6, 238–41, 257
attendant subdeacon, 40, 83, 93–4,
234–41, 243–4, 256, 261–2,
264–70, 273
oblationarius subdeacon, 91, 241–2,
258, 266–7
regionary subdeacon, 30, 83, 85–6, 223,
229, 231, 234–5, 237–8, 240–44,
246–8, 262–71, 273–5
- supplementarius*, 233, 255
- Supplices te rogamus*, prayer, 123, 269
- Supra quae*, prayer, 53, 269
- sustentatio*, 82–4, 93, 225, 234, 236,
240–41, 255, 266
- Taft, R., 61
- Te igitur*, prayer, 70, 258, 268
- Theodore of Sykeon, saint, 19, 181, 184,
185–6, 198
- Theodore I, pope, 160
- theology, 3–4, 21, 53–4, 62, 71, 73,
109–10, 113, 119, 122, 171, 174–5,
203–4, 208, 212
- Theophylact, archdeacon, 91, 103
- thurible, 36, 66–7, 83, 233, 236–9, 248,
261, 264, 275
- Tiber River, 10–11, 183
- titular church, *titulus*, 49, 72, 90, 92, 114,
233, 255, 259, 271
- tract, chant, 44, 238, 254, 263
- Trisagion, chant, 121, 158
- Turner, V., 139, 208, 213
- Unde et memores*, prayer, 53, 269
- Universal Prayer, 70
- vesterarius*, 37, 83, 231–3, 252
- vestments, clerical, 37–40, 52, 78, 103,
234–7; see also alb; amice;
chasuble; *cingulum*; dalmatic;
mappula; pallium; pin; *sindon*
- viaticum, 149, 195–6
- vicedominus*, 69, 83, 107, 222, 231, 244
- vigil, 61, 162, 253
- Vigilius, pope, 59, 133, 154
- Vitalian, pope, 44, 69
- Wilfrid of York, bishop, 19
- Women, 34, 49, 56, 67, 99–102, 112,
144, 148, 150, 158, 162, 166, 180,
195–6, 200, 209, 240–41, 247,
257–8, 266, 273–4
- Xenodochia*, 13
- Zachary, pope, 69, 128, 147, 155, 167, 181–3